7.0 Appendix – CEQA Findings

CEQA Findings for Projects 1 – 6 are provided on the following pages.

This page intentionally left blank.

FINDINGS OF FACT REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

FOR THE SILVERADO POWER WEST LOS ANGELES COUNTY PROJECT

PROJECT SITE NO. 1 (North Lancaster Ranch)

COUNTY PROJECT NO. R2011-00833-(5)

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 20110079

ZONE CHANGE NO. 201100005

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 201100109

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2012061068

PROJECT FINDINGS ORGANIZATION

Section 1	Introduction
Section 2	Findings Regarding Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Have Been Mitigated to a Less than Significant Level
Section 3	Findings Regarding Cumulative Environmental Effects Which are Not Significant or Which Have Been Mitigated to a Less Than Significant Level
Section 4	Findings Regarding Project Alternatives
Section 5	Findings Regarding the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Section 6	CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 and 15092 Findings
Section 7	CEQA Guidelines Section 15084(D)(3) and 15084(D)(4) Findings
Section 8	Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(C) Findings
Section 9	Nature of Findings
Section 10	Reliance on Record
Section 11	Relationship of Findings to EIR
Section 12	Custodian of Records
Exhibit A	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP")

SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The County of Los Angeles ("County") Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") hereby certifies and finds that the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County ("Project") Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR"), State Clearinghouse Number 2012061068, has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., "CEQA") and the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Cal. Code Regs. Sections 15000 et seq., "CEQA Guidelines").

The Project Final EIR consists of the following documents: (1) December 2013 Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR" or "DEIR"); (2) December 2013 Technical Appendices to the Draft EIR; and (3) March 2014 Final EIR.

The Commission hereby further certifies that it received, reviewed and considered the information contained in the following: (i) the Final EIR; (ii) the applications for Zone Change No. 201100005 and Conditional Use Permit No. 20110079; and (iii) all hearings, and submissions of testimony from County officials and departments, the Applicant (as defined herein), the public, other public agencies, community groups, and organizations.

Concurrently with the adoption of these findings, the Commission adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"), attached hereto as Exhibit A. Having received, reviewed and considered the foregoing information, as well as any and all information in the administrative record and the record of proceedings, the Commission hereby makes the following Findings of Fact ("Findings") pursuant to and in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15090:

SECTION 1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

1.1.1 Project Location.

The Project site is located in the northern portion of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The EIR analyzed a total of six (6) individual Project sites (collectively, "Projects" or "Projects 1-6"), which will each be subject to separate review and approval by the County.[1]

These Findings specifically pertain to "Project 1", which is approximately 240 acres and located at 110th Street West and West Avenue B, in Lancaster, California (also referred to as "North Lancaster Ranch"). The Assessor's Parcel Numbers ("APNs") for Project 1 are 3262-001-006 and 3262-001-005. When complete, Project 1 would produce 20 megawatts ("MW") of electricity from solar photovoltaic modules.

[1] The six individual Projects are not dependent upon each other for success. Each Project can succeed as a stand-alone project if other projects are not approved by Los Angeles County or if technical or financial problems delay or block the completion of a Project. CEQA allows for a group of projects to be analyzed as a single EIR; each Project must also receive approval of its CUP application and other entitlements on the merits of the individual Project and individual site.

1.1.2 Project Description—Features Common to Projects 1 - 6.

There are certain general Project characteristics and features that will apply to each of the individual six Project sites, including Project 1, as follows:

All six of the Projects would be designed and built using the same or similar methods and would have similar Project characteristics. The Projects would utilize photovoltaic ("PV") technology on fixed-tilt or tracker mounting supports. The proposed PV Projects would be constructed in phases and operated for an estimated 35 years. Construction would generally take place during normal daylight hours and would conform to County construction requirements.

Each Project would consist of the following elements:

- PV modules;
- PV module mounting system;
- Balance of system and electrical boxes (e.g., combiner boxes, electrical disconnects);
- Substation (Projects 1 – 5);
- Electrical inverters and transformers;
- Electrical AC collection system, including switchgear;
- Data monitoring equipment;
- Generation tie line; and
- Access roads and chain link perimeter security fencing.

Solar PV Generating Facilities

The Solar Generating Facilities ("SGFs") are designed for optimum performance and ease of maintenance. The Projects would consist of a series of PV module arrays mounted on racking systems, which are typically supported by a pile-driven foundation design. The foundation design would be determined based on the full geotechnical survey. The module mounting system, or racking system, would have a fixed-tilt or tracker PV array configuration and would be oriented south to maximize the amount of incident solar radiation absorbed over the course of the year. Electricity from a series of PV arrays would be funneled and combined at combiner boxes located throughout the SGF. The electrical current would then be further collected and combined prior to feeding the inverters. The SGF would be laid out in a PV block design to allow adequate area for maintenance in the way of clearances or access roads.

Inverters would be consolidated in areas to minimize cable routing and trenching and ensure minimal electrical losses. The alternating current ("AC") from the inverters would be routed through an AC collection system and consolidated within system switchgear. The final output from the SGF would be processed through a transformer to match the interconnection voltage. Electrical safety and protection systems would be provided to meet utility, International Organization for Standardization, and regulatory codes and standards. The energy would be

delivered to the regional electrical distribution network. A security perimeter fence with appropriate signage for public protection would be installed. Points of ingress/egress would be accessed by locked gates for facility services and maintenance.

Photovoltaic Modules

The SGFs would require installation of PV modules. The total number of PV modules required would depend on the technology selected, optimization evaluation, and detailed design. The market conditions, economic considerations, and the environmental factors would be taken into account during the detail design process. The following PV module technologies or equivalent are being considered for incorporation into the Projects:

- PV thin-film technology
- PV crystalline silicon technology
- Fixed-tilt configuration; and
- Tracking design configuration.

The modules configured with a fixed tilt would be oriented toward the south and angled at a degree that would optimize solar resource efficiency. For the tracking configuration, the modules would rotate from east to west over the course of the day. Modules would be non-reflective and highly absorptive.

Standard Installation, Array Assembly, and Racking

The final racking system would be determined by optimization evaluations and economic assessments and incorporated into the detailed design. Likewise, the final foundation design would be determined based on the geotechnical survey for each of the PV Project locations. Once the foundation has been installed, the module mounting system would be installed on it. For a tracking configuration, motors would be installed to drive the tracking mechanism. The PV modules would be delivered to each site during construction to support the installation schedule. The module mounting system would be oriented in rows within a PV design block, presenting a standard and uniform appearance across the facility. The panel configuration would be uniform in height and width.

Collection, Inverters, AC Collection, and Transformers

Modules would be electrically connected into strings. Each string would be funneled by electrical conduit (typically underground) wiring to combiner boxes located throughout the solar field power blocks. The output power cables from the combiner boxes would be again consolidated and feed the direct current ("DC") electricity to inverters, which convert the DC to AC. Underground electrical cables would be installed using ordinary trenching techniques, which include excavation of trenches to accommodate conduits. Wire depth and trench backfill would be in accordance with local, state, and federal codes.

The AC energy would be stepped up to the appropriate interconnection voltage by system transformers to match the voltage at the grid interconnection. As required, switchgear cabinetry

would be provided where necessary for circuit control. All electrical inverters, transformers, and gear would be placed on concrete foundation structures.

Commissioning of equipment would include testing, calibration of equipment, and troubleshooting. All electrical equipment, inverters, collector system, and PV array systems would be tested prior to commencement of commercial operations.

Substations

For Projects 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, which require substations, the area for the substations would be appropriately graded and excavated to accommodate transformer equipment, the control building foundation, and oil containment area. Foundations for equipment within each approximately 1-acre substation would be constructed with reinforced concrete.

Structural components in the Project substation area would include:

- Transformers, switchgear, and safety systems; and
- Footings and oil containment system for transformers.

Interconnection Descriptions

Each inverter would be fully enclosed and pad mounted and would be approximately 90 inches in height. The AC output of two inverters would be fed via underground cable into the low-voltage side of the inverter step-up transformer, generally within 20 feet of the inverters. Each transformer would be mounted on a concrete pad and enclosed together with switchgear and a junction box. Transformers are typically 87 inches in height. The high-voltage output of the transformer would be combined in series via underground collector cables to the junction box of the nearest transformer, ranging from as little as 60 feet to as much as 700 feet. The collector system cables would be tied throughout the SGF at underground junction boxes to the main underground collector cables, which would be composed of a larger wire gauge, to the location of the generator step-up transformer ("GSU"), as applicable at each Project location. The main collector cables would rise into the low-voltage busbar and protection equipment that would be enclosed together with the GSU. The primary switchgear includes the main circuit breaker and utility metering equipment, and it would be enclosed separately but pad-mounted together with the GSU. Both the GSU and the primary switchgear would stand approximately 87 inches in height.

The output of the switchgear would be the start of the Project generation tie ("gen-tie") line. The connections from the SGFs to the regional transmission lines are made through the construction of gen-tie lines. Los Angeles County requires that all gen-tie lines be underground except when other applicable regulations require otherwise, and Projects 1 − 6 are each designed in this manner. Each gen-tie line would consist of three phases of either underground or overhead conductor and a disconnect switch. The overhead conductor would be mounted on either wooden or tubular steel poles of varying heights ranging from 55 to 85 feet. Pole height would be determined by the span between poles as defined in the final design for each Project.

Data Collection Systems

Each Project would be designed with a comprehensive Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition ("SCADA") system for remote monitoring of facility operation and/or remote control of critical components. Within the site, the fiber optic or other cabling required for the monitoring system, would be installed with the gathering line system throughout the solar field leading to a centrally located (or series of appropriately located) SCADA system cabinets. The external telecommunications connections to the SCADA system cabinets may be through either wireless or hard-wired telecommunications to a centralized data collection center.

The system would also include a permanent meteorological data collection system. The station would have several weather sensors: a pyranometer for measuring solar irradiance, a thermometer to measure air temperature, a barometric pressure sensor, and two wind sensors to measure speed and direction. These sensors would be connected to a data logger, which would compile the data for transmission to the data collection center.

Construction

Construction for each of the six Project facilities consists of three major phases: (1) site preparation, (2) PV system installation testing and startup, and (3) site cleanup/restoration. Best Management Practices ("BMPs") would be required during all construction phases of the Projects. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP") incorporating BMPs for erosion control would be prepared and approved before the start of construction. The Projects would also comply with applicable post-construction water quality standards adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board ("RWQCB").

PV System Installation

PV system installation includes earthwork, grading, and erosion control, as well as construction of the plant substation and erection of the PV modules, supports, and associated electrical equipment. System installation would begin with teams installing the steel/concrete piers support structures. The exact design would be finalized pending evaluation of soil conditions.

The proposed method of installation would be the use of vibration-driven pile foundations. This step would be followed by panel installation and electrical work. A very limited volume of concrete would be required for the substation footings, foundations, pads for the transformers, and other substation equipment. Silverado Power, LLC ("Applicant") does not propose to use excavated and poured footings or foundations for the PV arrays. Concrete would be produced at an off-site location by a local provider and transported to the Project sites by truck.

The enclosures housing the inverters have a pre-cast concrete base. Final concrete specifications would be determined during detailed design engineering consistent with applicable building codes. The primary site preparation method for the PV modules would be mowing, because the majority of the six sites are very flat with little change in topography. However, there may be a few instances where limited earthwork, including ponding area leveling of less than one foot in depth, and erosion control cultivation may be required to accommodate the placement of PV arrays. Other than required grading for roads, pads, and drainage features, and standard

trenching and installation work, no other earthwork would be performed within the array areas. Erosion control techniques used during construction may include the use of silt fencing, straw bales, temporary catch basins, inlet filters, and truck tire muck shakers. Construction of the PV arrays includes the installation of support beams, module rail assemblies, PV modules, inverters, transformers, and buried electrical cables.

Wastes generated during construction may include the following: cardboard, wood pallets, copper wire, scrap steel, common trash, and wood wire spools. The Applicant does not expect to generate hazardous waste during construction. However, field equipment used during construction would contain various hazardous materials such as hydraulic oil, diesel fuel, grease, lubricants, solvents, adhesives, paints, and other petroleum-based products contained in construction vehicles.

Operations & Maintenance

Upon commissioning, the Projects would enter the operational phase. For the duration of the operational phase, the Projects would be operated and monitored remotely by a third party contractor, with an assumed two on-site visits for security, maintenance, and system monitoring per quarter (total of eight trips per year) by two third party employees in one light duty truck, and two on-site visits by four third party employees for biannual panel washing that includes one light duty truck and one water truck. Therefore the trips would be no more than 10 trips annually for security, maintenance, system monitoring and panel washing. There would be no personnel stationed on-site full time during operations. The PV arrays would produce electricity passively with minimal moving parts; therefore, maintenance requirements would be limited. Any required planned maintenance would be scheduled to avoid peak-load periods, and unplanned maintenance would typically be responded to as needed depending on the event.

Security

To ensure the safety of the public and the facilities, the sites would be fenced and signs would be posted. Security measures would be installed as necessary to mitigate and/or deter unauthorized access. Access to the sites would be controlled and gates would be installed at the roads entering the property.

Decommissioning Plan

A Decommissioning Plan for each of the Projects would be prepared and submitted for approval to Los Angeles County prior to obtaining a grading permit. The plan would assure that the land is protected during operations and returned as closely as possible to its original state upon termination of the use of the land as a SGF. It is unknown at this time if solar energy electricity production would continue to be utilized on this land in excess of 35 years, and thus the future long-term use of the site beyond 35 years is unknown. The life of each facility is presently proposed to be 35 years. The Decommissioning Plan would be implemented in the early summer of the year or year following the time of facility closure thus allowing the site reclamation to be completed outside of the rainy season and before winter begins. In the event that a Project ceases

operations prior to completion of the 35-year estimated life of the Project, applicable provisions of the Decommissioning Plan would commence.

Section 1.1.3 Project Description—Features Unique to Project Site 1

Project 1 (North Lancaster Ranch) would have a generating capacity of 20 MW-AC and would be located on approximately 240 acres of primarily unproductive agricultural land in Los Angeles County. The facility would operate year-round, producing electric power during daytime hours. The power generated by Project 1 would be connected to the existing Southern California Edison ("SCE") 66 kilovolt ("kV") transmission line with the voltage transformation equipment and system safety equipment constructed on the site. For Phases 1 and 2 of Project 1, electricity would be delivered to the existing SCE 66 kV transmission line running north-south along the west side of 110th Street West.

Phase 1 of Project 1 would interconnect via an undergrounded 0.02 mile gen-tie line across 110th Street West originating at the DC collection system within the Project 1 site. Phase 2 of Project 1 would interconnect via an undergrounded 0.54-mile gen-tie line originating at the DC collection system within the Project site.

From the southwest corner of APN 3262-001-006, the gen-tie route would be as follows: 0.02 miles underground across West Avenue B, 0.5 miles underground in the public right-of-way ("ROW") along the south side of West Avenue B, and 0.02 miles underground across 110th Street West. Alternatively, the gen-tie may be placed 0.5 miles underground in the public ROW along the north side of West Avenue B, and 0.02 miles underground across 110th Street West.

Project 1 Telecommunications Lines

The primary telecommunication method is expected to be direct fiber optic cables placed overhead or underground along the path of the gen-tie line within the public ROW or located on private land from the Project 1 site to existing or proposed telecommunication infrastructure. A dedicated broadband connection from a local provider will be secured at the site.

Project 1 Construction

Project 1 would be constructed in two phases. The proposed schedule for Phase 1 is to begin site preparation and construction in the third quarter of 2014 and complete construction within approximately six months. The proposed schedule for Phase 2 is to begin site preparation, including any necessary demolition, and construction in the first quarter of 2015, and complete construction within approximately six months, being commercially operational by the end of the second quarter of 2015. Construction will begin with initial mowing and fine grading for the substation area. The substation area will initially be utilized as the Project staging areas. The staging areas typically include construction offices, a first aid station and other temporary buildings, worker parking, truck loading and unloading facilities, and an area for system assembly.

Subsequent areas to be graded would include internal Project roads and equipment pad locations. The grading acreage for Project 1 (inclusive of staging areas, roads and equipment pad locations) would be 20.5 acres.

The expected construction water use for the Project 1 site would be a maximum of 50 acre feet of water in 2014 and 50 acre feet of water in 2015, from outside of the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin ("Basin") or other authorized water that would be obtained from an off-site provider. Depending upon climatic conditions during construction, the estimated water use could be much lower. Construction water needs would be limited to soil conditioning and dust suppression. Potable water would be brought in to the Project 1 site for drinking and domestic needs.

Construction of the site, beginning with site preparation through equipment setup and commencement of commercial operation, is expected to last approximately six months for each phase. The on-site workforce would consist of laborers, electricians, supervisory personnel, support personnel, and construction management personnel. Construction would generally occur during daylight hours, Monday through Friday. Construction activities would be conducted consistent with Los Angeles County regulations regarding hours of construction. Project 1 is expected to create 100 new jobs at peak crew size during the construction phase.

Project 1 Operations

No personnel would be stationed at the Project 1 facility, and no occupied structures would be built on the site. Full and part-time positions over the life of Project 1 would be required for periodic operation and maintenance activities and would be performed by a third party contractor. The operations water requirements would be 2.9 acre feet per year ("AFY").

Section 1.1.4 Discretionary Actions Required for Project 1

Implementation of Project 1 will require discretionary approval actions by the County, including:

- **Conditional Use Permit ("CUP")**: To authorize the construction and operation of a solar photovoltaic electricity generating plant on 240 acres and installation of a water tank in the A-2 Zone. Project 1 meets the definition of "electric generating plant" in the Los Angeles County Zoning Code. Pursuant to Section 22.24.150, electric generating plants are a use subject to a conditional use permit in the A-2 Zone.
- **Zone Change**: To authorize a Zone Change from the A-1-2 (Light Agricultural) zone, to A-2 (Heavy Agricultural) zone.

Section 1.1.5 Statement of Project Objectives

Together, proposed Projects 1 – 6 would meet the existing and future demand for electricity generated from clean, renewable technology by generating 172 MW of electrical energy from the sun. Recent legislation enacted in California recognizes the multiple benefits associated with the development of renewable energy resources. These benefits include a reduced reliance on fossil fuel, diversification of energy portfolios, reductions in greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions, and the creation of "green" jobs within the state of California. Additionally, the Projects would assist

California in meeting the newly established Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards ("RPS"). Senate Bill 14 established RPS targets for California, stating: "All retail sellers of electricity shall serve 33 percent of their load with renewable energy by 2020." State government agencies have been directed to take all appropriate actions to implement this target in all regulatory proceedings, including siting, permitting, and procurement for renewable energy power plants and transmission lines.

Each of the six proposed PV Project sites, including Project 1, qualify as eligible renewable energy resources as defined by the California Public Resources Code, and would help the State meet the objective of increasing renewable energy generation. In addition, Projects 1-6 would contribute much-needed competitive energy during peak power periods to the electrical grid in California.

As another key objective, Projects 1-6 have each been sited to minimize impacts to the environment and the local community as follows:

- Using disturbed land or land that has been previously degraded from prior use;
- Using existing electrical distribution facilities, rights-of-way, roads, and other existing infrastructure where feasible to minimize the need for new electrical support facilities; and
- Minimizing impacts to threatened or endangered species or their habitats, wetlands and waters of the United States, cultural resources, and sensitive land uses.

SECTION 1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT PROCESS

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, the County completed an Initial Study (June 13, 2012) for the proposed Project, and determined that an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") was required. A Notice of Preparation ("NOP"), including the Initial Study was circulated to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, responsible, trustee, and interested agencies, and key interest groups beginning June 20, 2012 to solicit comments on the proposed content of the Draft EIR. The NOP was circulated for the required 30-day comment period which ended July 20, 2012. A Scoping Meeting was held on July 14, 2012 at the Lancaster Library located at 601 West Lancaster Boulevard in Lancaster, California, to facilitate public review and comment on the Project.

The Draft EIR includes the Initial Study, the comment letters received during the public review period in response to the NOP, and a transcript of verbal comments received during the Scoping Meeting (see Draft EIR Appendix A-1 to A-5). All NOP comments relating to the EIR were reviewed and the issues raised in those comments were addressed, to the extent feasible, in the Draft EIR.

Potentially significant environmental impacts addressed in the Draft EIR include Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, Hazards and Hazardous

Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The Draft EIR analyzed both Project-level and cumulative effects of the Project on these topics and identified a variety of mitigation measures to minimize, reduce, avoid, or compensate for the potential adverse effects of the proposed Project.

The Draft EIR also analyzed five potential alternatives to the proposed Project, including: 1) No Project Alternative; 2) Lower Intensity Projects; 3) Select Other Project Sites; 4) Rooftop Solar Generation; and 5) Wind Energy Generation. Potential environmental impacts of each of these alternatives were discussed at the CEQA-prescribed level of detail and comparisons were made to the proposed Project.

The Initial Study determined that the Project would result in less than significant or no impact to several environmental resource areas:

1) **Mineral Resources**: The Project would not have the potential to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region, including those identified in a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

2) **Employment, Population & Housing**: The Project would provide significant short-term employment for construction workers during the two year construction period. The duration of construction for the Projects would be less than two years; and construction personnel would commute to the Projects from Lancaster, the Los Angeles areas, and Kern County. However, jobs would be temporary and would be for the two year construction period. Construction workers would not establish new households and are not anticipated to permanently relocate to the area. Additionally, adequate construction personnel presently living in Los Angeles and Kern County would fill all of the jobs that will be available. Area population, housing demands and the need for educational facilities and libraries would not be affected significantly because jobs that would be created are short term in nature; therefore, they would not be impacted by the Projects. Employment, Population, and Housing would not be impacted because the Projects do not require a significant number of personnel to operate them once they are built and producing electricity, and they do not have growth inducing impacts to the local community. Requirements for operations and maintenance are not significant and would be conducted by a few specialized contracted third-party personnel who will cover the Projects. There is no operations and maintenance building on any of the Projects 1-6.

3) **Recreation**: The Project would have no impact on recreation opportunities in the area. There are adequate recreation opportunities in the area, and the availability of these would not change as a result of the Project.

Following the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("LACDRP") internal departmental review and analysis of the proposed Project through the screencheck process, the Draft EIR was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, and circulated for public review period beginning January 6, 2014. The 45-day public review period required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15087 ended on February 19, 2014.

A public hearing was held before the County's Hearing Examiner to take public testimony on the Draft EIR, at Lancaster Library located at 601 West Lancaster Boulevard in Lancaster, California, held at 1:00 p.m. on February 1, 2014. Approximately 80 people attended the Hearing Examiner meeting, and 26 attendees provided oral comments on the Draft EIR. A transcript of the oral comments made at the Hearing Examiner Meeting is contained in Section 2.0 of the Final EIR.

SECTION 1.3 PROJECT FINDINGS INTRODUCTION

The Findings made by the County, pursuant to Section 21081 of CEQA, and Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, on the consideration of Project 1 of the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project in unincorporated Los Angeles County, California are presented below. All potentially significant impacts of the Project identified in the Final EIR are included herein, and are organized according to the resources affected.

The Findings in this document are for Project 1 of the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project, and are supported by information and analysis from the Final EIR and other evidence in the administrative record.

For each significant impact, a Finding has been made as to one or more of the following, in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091:

A. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects on the environment.

B. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.

A narrative of supporting facts follows the appropriate Finding. For all of the impacts, one or more of the findings above have been made. The proposed Project will not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts.

SECTION 2.0 FINDINGS REGARDING POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH ARE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

All Final EIR mitigation measures, as set forth in the MMRP (attached as Exhibit A to these findings) have been incorporated by reference into the conditions of approval for Project 1. These mitigation measures and conditions of approval will result in a substantial mitigation of the effects of Project 1, such that the effects are not significant or have been mitigated to a level of less than significant. Specifically, the Commission has determined, based on the Final EIR, that Project 1 design features, mitigation measures, and conditions of approval will reduce

Project impacts concerning Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems to a level of less than significant.

2.1 AESTHETICS

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have significant visual impacts to the Project area if it had a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; would be visible from, or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail; substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features; or create a new source of substantial light or glare which will adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Aesthetics.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are no designated scenic highways in the vicinity of the Project 1 site. It is highly unlikely that the Project 1 site would be visible from the Foothills Area or Quartz Hill, which are both located over 9 miles from the site. Even though these areas are at higher elevations, from this distance the proposed Project 1 site would fade into the flat landscape. **(DEIR at 4.1-3)**. The proposed SGFs would be not located along or in proximity to a state scenic highway and would not substantially damage or impact scenic resources such as trees (including Joshua trees) or rock outcroppings. There are no historic buildings located within the Project 1 site. **(DEIR at 4.1-105)**.

The proposed Project 1 site is currently a fallow agricultural field, and is typical of the surrounding landscape. The visual quality of the Project 1 site is low. The site itself does not have unique or rare features, or hold special significance. The topography is uniform and flat. Vegetation is uniform and consists of grasses and short shrubs. No permanent water features occur on the site, and there are no features or characteristics that set the site apart from the surrounding landscape. **(DEIR at 4.1-105)**.

No trails are located on the Project Site 1. Therefore construction or operation of the SGF and gen-tie line would not cause the vacation of any portion of any trail, nor would it obstruct expansive views from any trails. The Project Site 1 may be visible from elevated locations along the Pacific Crest Trail, from certain locations in the California Poppy Reserve, and would be visible from portions of the Little Buttes area. The nearest trails identified are associated with Little Buttes, approximately 0.7 miles southeast of the site. The SGF would be visible from trails

in the Little Buttes area when not screened or partially screened by topography. The California Poppy Reserve is located approximately 4.7 miles southwest of the site and approximately 8.5 miles from the Pacific Crest Trail. Even if visible, Project site 1 would be barely discernible from the Poppy Reserve and the Pacific Crest Trail due to distance, and largely fade into the flat landscape. If it is discernible, it would appear as a rectangular form similar to an agricultural field in shape and size. The Little Buttes Trail, an adopted proposed multiple-use County trail, runs parallel to the Project site along West Avenue B. The Project site would be dominant in views when trail users are located adjacent to the site. There are no County-designated bikeways within 4 miles of the Project site. **(DEIR at 4.1-3; 4.1-78; 4.1-100)**

90th Street West, located approximately 1.3 miles east of Project Site 1, is considered a potential scenic route by the City of Lancaster's Master Environmental Assessment (City of Lancaster 2009a). 90th Street West is located at a slightly lower elevation than the proposed SGF. As shown in DEIR Figure 4.1-6, the landscape between 90th Street West north of West Avenue B and the site is very flat. South of 90th Street west, the proposed Project 1 site would be screened by terrain associated with the Little Buttes area. Because of the low profile of the solar modules and the level to lower elevation of 90th Street West compared to the site, where visible the SGF would likely fade into the flat landscape and not dominate the view. **(DEIR at 4.1-4)**. The proposed Project 1 gen-tie lines would be undergrounded from the proposed Project 1 site, under the adjacent road, to a riser next to an existing pole. **(DEIR at 4.1-78)**.

Construction activities and equipment on Project 1 site would be noticeable from vistas on top of and around Little Buttes because of the close proximity of the SGF. During construction of the SGF, disturbance areas would appear as large patches of fine, buff-colored rock and soil. Construction activities may produce dust visible from Little Buttes and 90th Street West, but impacts would be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of the fugitive dust plan (Mitigation Measure A-1). Any trash, debris, and waste would be removed from the Project 1 site during construction and the site screened or partially screened by fencing. Adverse visual effects from construction would be temporary and last only during the construction time period, and would be less than significant with Mitigation Measures A-1, A-2 and A-3. **(DEIR at 4.1-93; 4.1-100; 4.1-105)**. Because construction activities would be limited to daylight hours, impacts from nighttime lighting would not occur. Lighting will comply with the Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Therefore, the impacts would be less than significant with implementation of MM A-5. **(DEIR at 4.1-113)**.

A post-construction visual simulation (DEIR Figure 4.1-31) was developed from a viewpoint on top of Little Buttes at approximately 0.7 mile southeast and 100 feet higher in elevation than the southeast corner of the Project 1 site. The overall contrast introduced to the landscape at this viewpoint was evaluated to be moderate, and no changes are anticipated to landforms. The visual effects of vegetation removal would be screened or mostly screened by the solar modules, and this change would not be visible from this perspective. The installation of the solar modules would create a weak contrast in terms of form, and a moderate contrast in terms of line, color, and texture. **(DEIR at 4.1-93)**.

In addition, other electric infrastructure, including the high-voltage transmission lines and a large wind farm, are also visible from the Project 1 site. Because this existing electrical infrastructure is also visible from scenic vistas from the Pacific Crest Trail and Little Buttes, and other PV

solar fields may be visible from the same scenic vistas (Antelope Valley Solar Phase I) the SGF would not significantly degrade views from nearby scenic vistas. Even where visible, the Project 1 site would not be a dominant element in the landscape unless the viewer is situated directly adjacent to the facility. At eight feet tall, the PV modules are relatively short, and given their design, which is to absorb sunlight instead of reflecting it, the modules would not be highly reflective. **(DEIR at 4.1-94)**.

Viewers such as nearby residents and travelers on local roads would still experience views of the open desert lands around the Project 1 site after the solar facility is constructed. Even where visible, the proposed SGF components would not be a dominant element in the landscape unless the viewer was directly adjacent to the facility. A contrast rating was conducted from the viewpoint shown in DEIR Figure 4.1-38 (approximately 0.25 miles east of the site) to assess the level of contrast that would be introduced by the proposed Project to landform, vegetation, or structures in terms of major landform characteristics (form, line, color, and texture). The height, bulk, pattern, and scale of the proposed Project 1 features are considerations in the contrast rating process. **(DEIR at 4.1-112).**

According to the contrast rating (provided in DEIR Appendix B-1.6), the SGF can be expected to introduce a low level of contrast to the landscape from this viewpoint. No changes to landforms or vegetation would be visible. The SGF would introduce new structures to the area, but the solar panel structures would be low-profile and the lines created would mimic the naturally flat lines of the foreground landscape. The color of the solar modules, which is dark gray at this distance and perspective, already exists in the landscape. From viewing points further than approximately 0.25 miles from the solar field, at approximately the same elevation, the solar facility would largely fade into the flat landscape and not dominate the view. **(DEIR at 4.1-112).**

Even though the SGF components are out-of-character with directly adjacent land (which is primarily rural residential and fallow agriculture), the SGF is not out-of-character when considering the context of the surrounding landscape. Rural development and public infrastructure are common in the landscape around the Project 1 site, and include an 800-acre water treatment plant, roadways, the Antelope Valley Freeway, communication towers, and rural residences. Wind turbines located at the foot of the Tehachapi Mountains are visible from the site as well. Viewers such as nearby residents and travelers on the Antelope Valley Freeway and West Avenue D would still experience views of the open desert lands around the SGF after the facility is constructed (DEIR Figure 4.1-38). A 10-foot vegetative buffer is proposed to mitigate views directly along the southern Project 1 site boundary for 0.25 mile, where it is adjacent to West Avenue D. **(DEIR at 4.1-112).**

Because other structures including PV solar facilities are common in the vicinity of the Project 1 site and in the larger Project area, and because the site itself is not characterized by high visual quality, the visual impact of the site on the existing visual character of the proposed site and its surroundings would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.1-112).** Project 1's visual impacts are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

A-1 A Fugitive Dust Control Plan to minimize dust (visual pollution) shall be prepared and implemented.

A-2 The Project site shall be maintained free of debris, trash, and waste during construction.

A-3 The Project site shall be visually screened or partially screened during construction by fencing.

A-4 A landscape plan shall be developed for each Project prior to Project construction that shows the detail of a 10-foot wide screening vegetation buffer intended to screen or partially screen the Project visually from area residents or travelers on nearby roadways.

A-5 All lighting shall comply with applicable provisions of the Los Angeles County Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Lights shall be limited to types allowed by the ordinance, installed below maximum allowed heights, pointed downwards and shielded to minimize light trespass, and mounted on essential infrastructure rather than on separate light poles except where poles are required by regulation or by governing agency. Lighting will comply with the hours of operation requirements in the ordinance, and utilize automatic control devices to comply with time limits except where permitted by Los Angeles County. Lighting will be maintained in good repair at all times.

2.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant impact on Agriculture and Forestry Resources if it would: convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use; conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract; conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)); result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Finding:

Project 1 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Agriculture and Forestry Resources. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

As currently mapped under 2010 data from the Department of Conservation ("DOC") Farmland Monitoring and Mapping Program ("FMMP"), the Project 1 site contains no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. **(DEIR at 4.2-5)**. Project 1 also contains no forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. **(DEIR at 4.2-8)**.

Project 1 is located within the Los Angeles County Zoning Ordinance designation A-1 (Light Agriculture), which does not contain provisions for renewable energy development. However, a zone change application has been submitted. The future zoning of the property is A-2 (Heavy Agriculture). According to LACDRP, a solar electricity generating facility is allowed in Zone A-2 with the issuance of a CUP. Furthermore, Project 1 will not preclude future agricultural uses. Project 1 and the gen-tie line are located within a LACDRP Agricultural Opportunity Area. The Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan Policy states that these areas should be protected from incompatible uses. The Antelope Valley Area Plan states that applications for non-agricultural uses in the LACDRP Agricultural Opportunity Area ("AOA") areas will be evaluated for their impact upon adjacent agricultural operations. **(DEIR at 4.2-6 to 4.2-7)**.

Project 1 would generate electrical power through renewable solar PV technology which is an allowable use on the site with a CUP and zone change. Project 1 would involve conversion of land that was formerly used for agricultural production to renewable energy production. Construction and operation of Project 1 would not involve other restrictions, obstructions, or resources that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. Additionally, Project 1 was last irrigated in 1972, and surrounding projects are mostly undeveloped and fallow agricultural land. Project 1 would produce power in a passive manner and would result in minimal air emissions, traffic, and noise, and would not affect adjacent agricultural operations. Additionally, the proposed property is not designated under a Williamson Act contract. As a result, construction and operation of Project 1 would not conflict with existing or proposed future zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, Project 1 impacts to existing agricultural use zoning, designated Agricultural Opportunity Areas, and Williamson Act contracts will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-7)**.

Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines will temporarily preclude future agricultural use at the Project 1 site location. Following the termination of power generating activities at the Project 1 Site, all facilities and equipment would be removed, and the land would be restored as near to its pre-development condition as possible, in the event a new similar land use is not contemplated at that time by then-current owners. A decommissioning and reclamation plan detailing land restoration activities will be provided, as required by Los Angeles County as part of the CUP approval. Additionally, the Applicant will be required to provide a decommissioning bond, or other suitable financial guarantee acceptable to the County, equal to the amount of money estimated to be required to decommission the Projects, including any additional environmental review which might become necessary, and restore the land to as near its pre-development condition as possible. The Project will not impact any land use outside the Project 1 site limits. Therefore, impacts regarding the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-8)**.

No mitigation measures are required for Agriculture and Forestry Resources.

2.3 AIR QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant impact on Air Quality if it would: conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; cumulatively produce a considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors); expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Air Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Pursuant to the Clean Air Act ("CAA"), the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District ("AVAQMD") is required to reduce project emissions of criteria pollutants for which the Mojave Desert Air Basin ("MDAB") is in non-attainment. Project 1 is located within a non-attainment area, which means that certain Project-related activities could potentially be subject to emission control strategies contained within the AVAQMD Federal 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan. Construction would involve activities that can result in emissions of particulate matter ("PM"). However, construction of PV panels and the generation-tie line would not require intense earthmoving activities, only the low-impact method of mowing the surface. Compliance with applicable rules, ordinances, plans, and policies would minimize PM emissions during construction. Project 1 construction emissions would not exceed emission thresholds, and would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-25)**. Since construction of Projects 1-6 would occur consecutively over the course of two years, construction of the six Projects could overlap, which may cause a peak in the Projects' daily construction emissions. However, maximum daily and annual construction emissions would not exceed the appropriate AVAQMD significant thresholds for all pollutants, even with the potential overlap in construction schedules. **(DEIR at 4.3-37)**.

During operation of Project 1, the Project site would undergo maintenance and security activities no more than 10 times annually (as needed), and would not create a daily increase in population or visitors. The assumption of 10 annual trips includes truck trips associated with panel washing. Project 1 would comply with AVAQMD rules and Los Angeles County ordinances, and is designed to be consistent with applicable county policies and the Attainment Plan. Therefore, Project 1 would not conflict with implementing the applicable air quality plan. **(DEIR at 4.3-25)**.

Project 1 emissions estimates are based on compliance with AVAQMD Rule 403 requirements for fugitive dust suppression, watering exposed surfaces two times daily. The short-term

emissions during Project 1 construction would not exceed AVAQMD significance thresholds. As such, Project 1 would not exceed thresholds, result in violating air quality standards, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. **(DEIR at 4.3-28)**. Likewise, even when all six Projects operate concurrently, the operation of all six Projects would not exceed annual thresholds, violate air quality standards, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. **(DEIR at 4.3-42)**.

Decommissioning of Project 1 (and each of the six Project sites) would require removal of the PV modules, PV module mounting system, electrical boxes, electrical inverters and transformers, electrical AC collection system, switchgear, data monitoring equipment, chain link perimeter security fencing, concrete ballasts, underground vaults, other concrete pads, and transporting all components off site. Air quality emissions from decommissioning would be generated from the pieces of equipment used and any fugitive dust from site preparation activities. Equipment used for decommissioning and removal of concrete ballasts, underground vaults, concrete pads, etc. generally would be similar to that used for construction, except that no mowing or clearing would be required.

Since decommissioning does not involve mowing or clearing activities, the level of fugitive dust emissions would be less than emissions created during construction. After removal of equipment and facilities, the site would need to be re-vegetated. Decommissioning would occur after at least 25 years of operation; therefore, equipment engine technology is likely to be more advanced, and fuels to be cleaner. Criteria pollutant emissions during decommissioning would be equal to or, more likely, less than those estimated from construction for Project 1, and will also be less than significant with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.3-42)**. Similar to criteria pollutant emissions, hazardous air pollutant emissions during decommissioning would be less than during construction due to advanced equipment engine technology and cleaner fuel and would therefore be less than significant. Exhaust from off-road equipment and on-road vehicles used during decommissioning and construction truck trips would not be expected to create objectionable odors, and would therefore be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-42).**

The MDAB is currently nonattainment for federal and state ozone standards and nonattainment for state PM_{10} standards, which may cause emissions from Project 1 to contribute to an existing or projected air quality standard exceedance. Implementing any of the six Projects (including Project 1) would increase short-term emissions related to construction, and a negligible increase in long-term emissions related to SGF operation and maintenance. Construction for all six sites is expected to be staggered, and may extend over two years. Nevertheless, due to the nature and size of each site, simultaneous construction would not result in emissions of ozone precursors or PM_{10} that exceed daily thresholds. As shown in DEIR Table 4.3-12, "Mitigated Peak Daily Concurrent Construction Emissions", and DEIR Table 4.3-13, "Peak Annual Concurrent Construction Emissions", the impacts would be less than significant prior to mitigation. Implementing control strategies to reduce PM_{10} further minimizes air emissions. As such, construction of Project 1 would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors). **(DEIR at 4.3-43)**.

During the operation phase, Project 1 will have no major emissions sources. Facility operating equipment that emits regulated air pollutants or requires AVAQMD permits is not planned at Project 1 or any of the six Project sites. As shown in DEIR Table 4.3-20, "Peak Annual Concurrent Operation Emissions", the impacts would be less than significant. As such, operation of Project 1 would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors). **(DEIR at 4.3-44)**.

Project 1 was analyzed for air impacts to nearby sensitive receptors; however, sensitive receptors would only be exposed during construction activities. PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations are expected to occur primarily from fugitive dust emissions during mowing, excavation activities and, to a lesser degree, during PV installation and paving. Rule 401 requires that airborne particles remain on the site from which they originate under normal wind conditions. Proper mitigation techniques must be implemented to ensure that fugitive dust is contained. Emissions are not expected to expose even the closest sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and, due to the distance between Project sites, simultaneous construction at two sites would not significantly impact the same sensitive receptors. **(DEIR at 4.3-44)**.

Operational emissions from Project 1 would not impact local air pollutant levels at nearby receptors. As mentioned above, sensitive receptors would only be exposed, if at all, during construction activities. The primary source of Project emissions during operation is the vehicles used by facility maintenance staff traveling to and from the site. Maintenance is expected to occur no more than 10 times per year. Overall, Project 1 would not result in an increase in VMT over the course of one summer or winter day. Thus, Project 1 would not result in new long-term stationary sources, nor would they result in a significant number of net new vehicular trips. Carbon monoxide (CO) impacts from operation of Project 1 to sensitive receptors would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-44)**.

Short-term concentration levels during the construction phase will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, including those resulting in a cancer risk greater than the EPA screening levels. **(DEIR at 4.3-45)**. Due to continuous construction of each of the six Project sites over the course of two years (which may overlap), long-term cancer impacts from construction activities to the nearest sensitive receptors were evaluated, and found that even with the cumulative contribution of health risk impacts from all six proposed Projects, the cumulative cancer risk to the identified sensitive receptors is still below the cancer risk exposure level. **(DEIR at 4.3-46)**. Short-term concentration levels during Project 1 site construction will neither expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, nor exceed the cancer risk screening levels. **(DEIR at 4.3-47)**.

Project 1's Air Quality impacts are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

AQ-1 Water active sites at least twice daily (locations where soil disturbance is to occur would be thoroughly watered before earthmoving) during construction, or, in locations where water alone does not suffice to suppress dust adequately apply nontoxic chemical soil

stabilizers, according to manufacturers' specifications. Temporarily stockpiled soil shall be secured with tarps or plastic sheeting or sprayed with non-toxic soil stabilizers.

AQ-2 All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).

AQ-3 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.

AQ-4 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not idle more than five minutes in any one hour.

AQ-5 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operation of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.

AQ-6 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.

AQ-7 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.

AQ-8 During array area preparation, mowing shall be used instead of grading and/or disking, and shall be limited to no more than 3.5 acres per day per site to further reduce dust emissions during construction.

AQ-9 All interior roads shall use long-lasting non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers designed for long-term dust stabilization on dirt roads.

AQ-10 Interior array areas shall have re-established pre-existing vegetation or be established with drought tolerant, native, or native compatible vegetation approved by the County biologist and compliant with Fire Department requirements, within two years of energization authorization of an array area by the Department of Public Works, Building and Safety Division, to provide long-term dust stabilization under the arrays.

AQ-11 Earth disturbing activities shall be suspended and/or additional water shall be applied to meet Rule 403 criteria if wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour.

AQ-12 Construction activity shall utilize electricity from power poles on or adjacent to the Project sites rather than use of temporary diesel power generators and/or gasoline power generators when electricity with adequate circuit capacity is available from power poles in proximity to construction areas.

AQ-13 In the event temporary night lighting is necessary for construction or maintenance purposes, lighting not requiring the use of diesel or gasoline driven generators shall be used.

2.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant impact on biological resources if it would: have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game Wildlife ("CDFW") or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ("USFWS"); have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations of CDFW or USFWS; have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including marshes, vernal pools, and coastal wetlands) or waters of the United States, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites; convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, southern California black walnut, etc.); conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas ("SEAs") (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Section 22.56.215), and the Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas ("SERAs"), (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Section 22.44, Part 6); or conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Biological Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 1 does not contain riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, wetlands, Joshua trees, or yucca trees on the site, and does not contain non-jurisdictional or state regulated waters. **(DEIR at 4.4-59)**. There are also no wetlands, vernal pools, or riparian habitat identified on the Project 1 site. No federally protected wetlands (including marshes, vernal pools, and coastal wetlands) or waters of the United States, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act

features, were identified on the Project 1 site. **(DEIR at 4.4-60)**. Project 1 does not contain oak trees, juniper trees, Joshua trees, or other unique native trees. **(DEIR at 4.4-62)**. Project 1 and the immediate vicinity do not contain or conflict with any Significant Ecological Areas ("SEAs"), Wildflower Reserve Areas, or Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas ("SERAs"). The closest SEAs to Project 1 are Fairmont and Antelope Buttes which are 4 miles south and Rosamond Lake which is 10 miles east. Therefore, Project 1 would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. **(DEIR at 4.4-63)**. There are also no adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plans in effect within the boundaries of the Project 1 site.

Project 1 has low potential for American badger, ferruginous hawk, merlin, and Le Conte's thrasher to occur onsite. There is moderate potential for mountain plover and burrowing owl to occur onsite based on habitat suitability. Burrowing owls were not observed onsite during 2013 targeted surveys but potential burrows were observed. In addition, although not a sensitive species, kit fox is plays an important role in providing burrow sites for burrowing owl and has potential to occur within Project 1. Potential for Swainson's hawk is low due to the lack of nesting and foraging habitat on the site. There is high potential for loggerhead shrike to occur onsite. Developing this site as a solar generating facility would remove habitat for this species and would result in a significant impact. Mitigation measures provided in Section 4.4.8 would reduce these impacts to less than significant; however, the 240 acres of land for Project 1 would be mostly unavailable as wildlife habitat during the life of Project 1. **(DEIR at 4.4-57)**.

Project 1 is located within an area of topographically homogeneous open space, and there are no local constraints to movement of resident or migratory wildlife that development of Project 1 would further aggravate. There are no known wildlife migration pathways that would be impacted by Project 1. **(DEIR 4.4-61)**.

Wildlife nursery areas on the Project 1 site may include nesting sites of native bird species, which are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-712; Ch. 128; July 13, 1918; 40 Stat. 755) and the California Fish and Game Code Section 3503. Burrowing owls may have suitable burrows on the Project 1 site, and protections for bird nesting and burrowing owls are provided in Mitigation Measures B-1, B-2, B-3 and B-4. The intent of acquiring mitigation lands would be to select available parcels that would replace lost breeding/foraging/winter foraging habitat and enhance the overall quality of habitat for a variety of species including migratory bird species. The potential to acquire parcels that would also maintain or enhance wildlife migration corridors in the area would also be considered. Planting of shrubs and native vegetation on the Project 1 site would improve the opportunities for shrub-nesting bird species on the Project 1 site when it is complete. **(DEIR 4.4-61)**.

Project 1 impacts to Biological Resources are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

B-1: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a qualified biologist shall be retained by the Applicant as the lead biological monitor subject to the approval of the LACDRP and CDFW. That person shall ensure that impacts to all biological resources are minimized or avoided, and shall conduct (or supervise) pre-grading field surveys for species that may be avoided, affected, or eliminated as a result of grading or any other site preparation activities. The lead biological monitor shall ensure that all surveys are conducted by

qualified personnel (e.g. avian biologists for bird surveys, herpetologists for reptile surveys, etc.) and that they possess all necessary permits and memoranda of understanding with the appropriate agencies for the handling of potentially-occurring special-status species. The lead biological monitor shall also ensure that daily monitoring reports (e.g., survey results, protective actions, results of protective actions, adaptive measures, etc.) are prepared, and shall make these monitoring reports available to LACDRP and CDFW at their request.

B-2: Pre-Construction surveys will be conducted prior to ground disturbance at each project site. These surveys will include all special-status species identified as having the potential to be present on the project site; including, but not limited to, badger, kit fox, southern grasshopper mouse, and the species listed below.

Pre-survey information gathering will include review of all available agency nest data and mapping.

- A focused pre-construction Swainson's hawk survey shall be conducted to locate any nesting sites within 5 miles of Projects 1 – 6. If Swainson's hawks or their active nests are located within 500 feet of the project sites, all construction-related work shall be postponed and CDFW will be consulted.

- Project-related activities likely to have the potential of disturbing suitable bird nesting habitat, which includes ground nesting birds, shall be prohibited from February 1 through August 31, unless a qualified monitoring biologist conducts nesting bird surveys prior to any construction-related disturbance to confirm the absence of active bird nests or bird nesting habitat. Disturbance shall be defined as any activity that physically removes or damages vegetation or habitat or any action that may cause disruption of nesting behavior such as loud noise from equipment or artificial night lighting. Surveys shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. If an active bird nest is discovered, disturbance within 500 feet for raptors shall be postponed until the nest is vacated, offspring are independent of the nest area and there is no evidence of further attempts at nesting. Limits of avoidance shall be marked with high-visibility flagging or fencing. The Applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures and submit the records to LACDRP and CDFW to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds.

- A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted on each site prior to grading. Pre-construction surveys for burrowing owl shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. The surveys shall follow the protocols set forth by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium (1993 and 2012).

  If burrowing owls are found during the pre-construction survey, then replacement burrows and habitat must be provided prior to the commencement of construction. The

Applicant shall be prepared to provide artificial replacement burrows in the event that owls are detected, either as wintering or breeding individuals.

Wintering individuals may be evicted with the use of exclusion devices followed by a period of seven days to ensure that animals have left their burrows. When it can be assured that owls are no longer using the burrows, the burrows can be hand-excavated and collapsed under the supervision of the avian biologist.

Breeding owls must not be disturbed and must be allowed to complete the raising of young until the fledglings can forage independently of adults and it can be confirmed that further attempts at nesting shall not be undertaken. When this has been confirmed, the owls can be evicted as described above for wintering animals.

- Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for special-status ground-dwelling reptiles, including but not limited to coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard. Surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground 4 to 6 weeks in advance of the survey effort, checking weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles or other species determined important by the qualified biological monitor (i.e., biologist must be appropriately permitted for collection and relocation activities) occurring within the work area prior to the start of work shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.

B-3: During grading, earthmoving activities, and other construction activities the biological monitor shall be present to inspect and enforce all mitigation requirements and to relocate any species that may come into harm's way to an appropriate offsite location of similar habitat. The biological monitor shall be authorized to stop specific grading or construction activities if violations of mitigation measures or any local, state, or federal laws are suspected. The biological monitor shall file a report of the monitoring activities with LACDRP and CDFW during construction activities, as frequently as required by LACDRP and CDFW. If ongoing biological monitoring of construction activities reveals the presence of any special-status reptiles within an active work area, then work shall be temporarily halted until the animals can be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones. Work areas shall be surveyed for special-status reptile species, such as the coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard, during construction activities. During the construction, surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground in appropriate work areas and checking them weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles occurring within the work area shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.

B-4: Mitigation lands shall be acquired for Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, special-status migratory and wintering birds, and alkali mariposa lily.

Swainson's hawk: Impacts due to development of the projects shall be mitigated by the acquisition of good quality Swainson's hawk habitat targeted within the Antelope Valley. Land shall be purchased or placed in a conservation easement or other suitable deed restriction and managed to maintain suitable habitat in perpetuity.

The proposed development is not expected to result in the "take" of Swainson's hawk; however, the Applicant shall be required to consult CDFW in the event of take, which may result in additional mitigation prescribed by CDFW. Although the Projects are not expected to result in "take" of Swainson's hawk, mitigation will still be required to alleviate the effects of cumulative impacts on raptor, migratory bird, and burrowing owl habitats:

Replacement land will be provided based on the quality of the mitigation land relative to the impacted habitat. The ratio of such replacement shall be determined as follows:

- A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 3 acres of development if the replacement land is superior nesting and foraging habitat contiguous to occupied nesting and foraging habitat, and is within a designated or proposed SEA.

- A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 2 acres of development if the replacement land is unoccupied irrigated land, contiguous to occupied habitat and providing superior quality foraging habitat with trees or other such nesting habitat;

- A ratio of 1 acre of replacement land for each acre of development if the replacement land provides similar foraging and nesting habitat.

Burrowing Owl: Mitigation for any occupied burrowing owl burrows found during preconstruction surveys will include a comprehensive tiered approach:

- Pre-construction and construction monitoring surveys conducted by a qualified biologist to detect potential new owl activity onsite;

- Disturbance avoidance of occupied burrows during nesting period February 1 – August 31;

- Impact avoidance of occupied burrows;

- Burrow exclusion and closure and offsite relocation (>100 m), as described previously in in B-2, will be conducted for unavoidable impacts to occupied burrows (after consultation with CDFW).

- Minimizing impacts by protecting in-place any owls, their burrows, and their immediate habitat by establishing setback zones and visual screens for burrows adjacent to construction activity; by placing visible markers, and by conducting construction worker awareness training. Setback widths will be applied as appropriate to the level of existing disturbance and owl stage of activity (e.g., for low to moderate construction-related disturbance activity outside the nesting season near burrows in currently high-traffic or disturbance areas, it is assumed owls are adapted to human disturbance and will not need a large setback).

- Mitigating unavoidable impacts to habitat: restore temporary impacts to pre-existing conditions; replace nesting/occupied and satellite burrows lost with the same number of suitable burrows on the mitigation site. Mitigation acreage for foraging habitat provided for Swainson's hawk will be sufficient to replace lost burrowing owl habitat because the hawk's replacement habitat will be in-kind or better (i.e., the Project habitat is low quality overall and mitigation habitat will be at least the same quality as the lost habitat OR will have higher quality habitat features overall, such as increased vegetative structure, higher numbers of prey species, less disturbance, and less potential for predation by domestic animals, etc.). Specific habitat considerations as provided in the CDFW 2012 burrowing owl guidance will be considered in selecting the overall habitat replacement acres for the project.

Alkali Mariposa Lily: Alkali mariposa lily will be avoided to the greatest extent possible. If preconstruction surveys reveal individuals that cannot be avoided, mitigation of lost alkali mariposa lily shall be provided at a minimum 1:1 ratio. This acreage will be calculated with input from LACDRP and CDFW. Additionally, because alkali mariposa Lilies have locally available seed sources, plantings of the lilies on appropriate soil types on Projects shall be implemented in selected areas. The lilies may also be transplanted from areas planned for disturbance to more suitable locations in the Project area. Transplantation locations must be situated within adequately buffered areas to be found suitable.

For all species the mitigation acreage may be located within the Project sites, but outside of the area of development, subject to LACDRP and CDFW approval, if acreage of sufficient quantity and quality exists.

B-5: Review and Approval of Habitat Management Lands Prior to Acquisition: The Applicant shall provide a mitigation land acquisition proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for their approval before acquiring the property. The proposal shall discuss the suitability of the property by comparing it to the selection criteria. As a part of the preparation of the land acquisition proposal, acreage quantification by habitat category will be developed with LACDRP and CDFW based on the following criteria:

> **Habitat Management Land Selection Criteria**: The Applicant must identify the region within which lands shall be acquired, and the type and quality of habitat to be acquired.
>
> Detailed criteria and acreage for each habitat category will be developed with Los Angeles County and CDFW. Foraging habitat shall be assessed as moderate to good with a capacity to improve in quality and value to Swainson's hawks, and must be within the Antelope Valley Swainson's hawk breeding range. Foraging habitat with suitable nest trees is preferred.
>
> **Habitat Management Lands Acquisition:** Prior to initiating ground-disturbing activities, the Applicant shall provide a proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for off-site mitigation land to be restored, enhanced, or maintained according to the requirements of the biological mitigation measures in this EIR. The proposal will require that mitigation lands identified shall be preserved as open space in perpetuity. Within 45 days of

acquiring the mitigation land(s), the Applicant shall record a permanent deed restriction on the mitigation land(s) to be preserved as open space. The deed restriction or conservation easement language shall be submitted to LACDRP and CDFW for review and approval prior to recordation. Alternatively, should a conservation easement on the mitigation land be offered, the permanent conservation easement shall be recorded to the satisfaction of LACDRP and CDFW.

The Applicant shall establish a fund sufficient for the restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation land(s) until such time when the mitigation land(s) become self-sustaining and until such time as the mitigation land(s) meet the requirements of this mitigation measure. The fund shall be established within 90 days of mitigation land(s) acquisition in an amount acceptable to the LACDRP and CDFW.

Land Acquisition Schedule and Financial Assurances: The Applicant shall complete acquisition, or execute an irrevocable option to purchase, of proposed Habitat Management lands and shall provide financial assurances for dedicating adequate funding for impact avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, if necessary, prior to the issuance of building permits. If an irrevocable option to purchase is utilized, the Applicant shall provide a proposed date of purchase which coincides with construction of the facility.

B-6: Prior to alteration of any streambeds, the Applicant shall enter into an agreement with the CDFW, pursuant to Sections 1601 through 1603 of the State Fish and Game Code.

B-7: Within all interior portions of the site within and adjacent to the proposed solar arrays, re-vegetation shall be accomplished (excluding interior roads) as follows:

Vegetation seeded in these areas shall comprise locally-sourced, native species if available, or, native compatible as approved by the County biologist if sufficient locally-sourced native seed stock is not available, approximating low-growing communities such as native perennial or annual grasslands (i.e., wildflower fields). Shrub species shall not be used due to these species inability to survive continued vegetation trimming. Vegetation shall be maintained in accordance with Los Angeles County Fire Department regulations.

2.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant effect on Cultural Resources if it would: cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5; cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Cultural Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

One historic-era site was identified within Project 1, "Site P-19-004222", which is a complex of partially demolished and dilapidated farm structures. Site P-19-004222 is in ruins, and lacks any physical integrity from its period of significance (c, 1950s) and the recordation of surface artifacts has likely exhausted the date potential for the site. P19-004222 is recommended as not eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources ("CRHR") or National Register of Historic Places ("NRHP") and no further management consideration of the resource is necessary. Therefore, construction and operation of Project 1 will cause no change in its level of significance. **(DEIR at 4.5-22)**.

There is a possibility that historical and/or archaeological materials would be uncovered during necessary subsurface excavations for the construction of the proposed Project 1. Although the likelihood of encountering archaeological resources on the site is considered low, this impact is potentially significant. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, which describes procedures to be followed in the event that cultural resources are discovered, is required. CUL-1 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-22)**.

No archeological resources were detected during the transect survey. Therefore, Project 1 would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. There is a possibility that historical and/or archaeological materials would be uncovered during necessary subsurface excavations for the construction of the proposed Project 1. Although the likelihood of encountering archaeological resources on the site is considered low, this impact is potentially significant. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, which describes procedures to be followed in the event that cultural resources are discovered, is required. CUL-1 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-27).**

Likewise, no paleontological resources were detected during the transect survey. Based on the paleontological assessment, it is unlikely that any intact significant paleontological resources are or will be located on the property. Therefore, Project 1 would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources. If Project 1 excavations reach 10 feet or more below current grade and reveal that older Quaternary deposits and/or the later Miocene deposits are exposed, there will be a higher potential for encountering significant vertebrate fossil remains. Deep cuts should be inspected by a qualified paleontologist in an attempt to identify the more sensitive older alluvial strata. There is a possibility that paleontological materials would be uncovered if excavations for the construction of Project 1 reach a depth of 10 feet or more below current grade. Although the likelihood of encountering paleontological resources within the Project 1 area is considered low, this impact is potentially significant. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure PALEO-1, the development of a Paleontological Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Plan ("PRMMP") by a qualified paleontologist if construction excavation depth

is below 10 feet or more below current grade, is required. PALEO-1 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-30)**.

There is no indication as a result of this study that human remains are present within the boundaries of Project 1. The records search and the field survey indicate no evidence of human remains on or near the sites. Project-related earth disturbance, however, has the potential to unearth previously undiscovered remains, resulting in a potentially significant impact. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2 that describes procedures to be followed in the event that human remains are discovered would ensure that impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-32)**.

Project 1 impacts related to Cultural Resources are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

CUL-1: In the event cultural resources are encountered during construction of the Projects, all ground-disturbing activities within the vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall be notified of the find. The archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to recordation and excavation of the finds and evaluation and processing of the finds in accordance with § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of, but are not limited to, stone, bone, fossils, wood or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites.

If the resources are determined to be unique historic resources as defined under § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, Mitigation Measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate Mitigation Measures for significant resources could include but not be limited to avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds.

No further earthwork shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any archaeological artifacts recovered because of mitigation will be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.

CUL-2: In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, California State Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 dictates that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to CEQA regulations and PRC § 5097.98. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.

PALEO-1: A qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the Applicant prior to excavations reaching 10 feet in depth or greater. The paleontologist shall develop and execute a PRMMP and supervise a paleontological monitor whom shall monitor all ground-disturbing activities associated with such excavations. The Program will outline the procedures to follow in regards to paleontological resources (e.g. monitoring protocols, curation, data recovery of fossils, reporting). If fossils are found during such excavation, the paleontological monitor shall be authorized to halt ground-disturbing activities within 25 feet of the find in order to allow evaluation of the find and determination of appropriate treatment according to the Program.

2.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant effect on Geology and Soils if it would: expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known active fault trace; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides; result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse; be located on expansive soil; have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater; or conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element.

Finding:

Project 1 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Geology and Soils. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 1 and the Project 1 gen-tie line are not located in an active or potentially active fault zone according to the California Geological Survey ("CGS") Seismic Hazard Zone Maps (CGS 2008) and Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map (CGS 2010). The closest fault zones are the San Andreas Fault Zone, which is located approximately 10.5 miles to the south southwest of the Project 1 site, and the Garlock Fault Zone, which is located approximately 15.5 miles northwest of the Project 1 site. Based on research and available information, Project 1 is susceptible to

seismicity, but is not susceptible to fault rupture; therefore, impacts involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-13)**.

The United States Geological Survey ("USGS") National Seismic Hazard Map (2008) indicates that Project 1 and the Project 1 gen-tie line are located in an area mapped from 30 to 40 percent gravity for peak horizontal acceleration with a 10 percent probability of exceedance in the next 50 years. According to the USGS, and dependent on structural design, 10 percent gravity is the lower threshold at which damages to structures are likely to occur. Based on geologic and soil conditions at the site, the USGS Ground Motion Parameter Calculator indicates that Project 1 facilities will need to be designed to sustain spectral accelerations of approximately 0.075 to 0.217 percent gravity (USGS 2012). **(DEIR at 4.6-15)**.

Project 1 has the potential to be subjected to ground motion during construction. However, because of the temporary nature of the construction period relative to the frequency of occurrence of significant seismic events, the potential for Project 1 construction to expose people or structures to substantially adverse effects due to seismicity and ground motion will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-15)**. During operation of the facility, all Project 1 structures and operational facilities will be designed in accordance with the California Building Code ("CBC") and applicable industry standards. The design and construction of Project 1 would comply with all applicable building codes and standards established by regulatory agencies, including the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the CBC. Therefore, Project 1 impacts related to seismic shaking and strong ground motion hazards would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-15)**.

The CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) does not identify Project 1 or the Project 1 gen-tie line as being located in zones with the potential for liquefaction or ground failure. Additionally, Project 1 is located on poorly sorted coarse grained materials with groundwater typically greater than 150 feet below ground surface (bgs) (USGS 2008). Based on available geologic information, the potential susceptibility of ground failure is less than significant for Project 1 construction and operation. **(DEIR at 4.6-19)**.

Project 1 and associated gen-tie lines contains generally low slopes of less than 1 percent gradient. As indicated in the Project description, development of the solar facility would not result in significant changes to existing site grades, and would not increase the susceptibility to slope failure. Additionally, the CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) does not identify Project 1 as being located in zones susceptible to landslides or slope failure. Therefore, the potential susceptibility for slope failure and landslides during construction and operation is less than significant for Project 1. **(DEIR at 4.6-20)**.

The soil series at the location of Project 1 and the Project 1 gen-tie line was indicated to be Rosamond fine sandy loam. This soil series has an erosion factor of 0.32 to 0.37, indicating a medium susceptibility to water erosion, and a wind erodibility group of 3, indicating a low to medium susceptibility to wind erosion. Implementation of appropriate erosion and sediment control BMPs will be implemented during construction and operation of Project 1, as outlined in Draft EIR Hydrology Section 4.9 and Air Quality Section 4.3, and will mitigate potential impacts to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.6-21)**.

Based on the information in the Geotechnical Critical Issues Analyses and Custom Soil Resource Reports prepared by Tetra Tech, the location of Project 1 and the Project 1 gen-tie line contains generally low gradient slopes. Development of solar facilities will not result in significant changes to existing site grades, and will not increase the susceptibility to slope failure. Additionally, the CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) indicates that Project 1 is not susceptible to landslide or liquefaction hazards. Although subsidence has occurred throughout the Antelope Valley, the majority of subsidence has been concentrated near the City of Lancaster and was caused by excessive groundwater pumping and decreased water levels. Subsidence in the vicinity of Project 1 was between 0 to 2 feet from 1930 to 1992. Surficial evidence such as fissures and differential settling has not been observed at or near the location of Project 1. Based on historic rates of subsidence and a relatively stabilizing water level due to reduced pumping and proposed aquifer management, future subsidence is expected to be minimal. In the event that minor future subsidence does occur, the potential impact to the proposed structural design (post mounted racking systems and relatively small foundations for electrical equipment) would be minimal. Based on geologic data and the proposed construction and operation as described in the Project description, Project 1 impacts to on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-23)**.

The soil series at the location of Project 1 and the Project 1 gen-tie line was indicated to be Rosamond fine sandy loam. This soil series is rated for a low shrink/swell potential. The potential for expansive soils to affect Project 1 is less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-25)**.

Project 1 does not propose the use of any sanitary facilities that will require septic tanks or sanitary wastewater disposal during either construction or operation. Therefore, no impact will occur. Project 1 (and gen-tie lines) are located on the floor of the Antelope Valley where the terrain is nearly flat. Project 1 is not in the hillside area and are not affected by Hillside Management Areas. **(DEIR at 4.6-26)**.

2.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant impact related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change if it would: generate direct or indirect GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment, based on any applicable threshold of significance; or conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 1's short-term GHG emissions during the construction phase (maximum daily emissions of 7,064 pounds per day) would not exceed the AVAQMD significance threshold for maximum

daily emissions (548,000 pounds per day). As such, Project 1 would not exceed thresholds or result in violating GHG standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected GHG violation. **(DEIR at 4.7-20)**.

Because construction of the six Project sites may overlap, concurrent construction emissions of Projects 1-6 were analyzed by emissions per year and thus compared to the annual GHG threshold of 100,000 metric tons of CO_{2e} per year, for long-term emissions. The unmitigated peak annual construction levels for all six Project sites are expected to result in annual GHG emissions below the most stringent annual threshold proposed by the AVAQMD (100,000 tons per year). As such, the Project will not exceed thresholds or result in violating GHG standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected GHG violation. **(DEIR at 4.7-23)**.

During operations, Project 1 facility operation would be limited to general maintenance, panel washing, and security. The primary source of emissions during operations is mainly the vehicles used by facility maintenance staff to and from the site. It is anticipated that operations and maintenance would utilize one water truck for panel washing and one light duty truck twice per year. Although Project 1 is scheduled for bi-annual panel washing, a maximum of ten trips were assumed for each Project (four round trips plus one additional round trip to be conservative). The operation emissions provided for each Project are considered the Project's baseline emissions, since it does not include any solar energy reductions. Because operations-related GHG emissions are considered long term, the AVAQMD daily significance threshold of 100,000 metric tons of CO_{2e} per year was used to analyze impacts during operations. The total annual operational emissions for Project 1 are 6.04 tons of CO_{2e} per year, which is well below the AVAQMD threshold of 100,000 tons per year. **(DEIR at 4.7-24)**. Likewise, concurrent operation of all six Projects is estimated to generate approximately 31 metric tons of CO_{2e} annually, which is well below the AVAQMD threshold. **(DEIR at 4.7-27)**.

Construction-related emissions from Project 1 would be temporary and finite in nature, below the applicable thresholds, and are consistent with the AB 32 Scoping Plan. Accordingly, Project 1's construction-related GHG emissions would not be a cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change. Project 1's operational GHG emissions would be negligible and not comprise a cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change and, therefore, would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.7-28).**

Furthermore, with implementation of Project 1, there would be an added environmental benefit of displacing GHG emissions in the region. The solar energy generation would offset emissions from electricity usage, which would otherwise be produced by fossil-fueled power generation facilities using petroleum, natural gas, or coal combustion. Project 1 would result in a temporary increase in GHG emissions which is below the most stringent proposed threshold; employ active solar technologies supportive of the state's goals to reduce GHG emissions; and is consistent with the County of Los Angeles's goals. **(DEIR at 4.7-29)**.

Project 1 would therefore be in accordance with the state's need for the construction of renewable energy power plants to meet the state's GHG reduction objectives including:

- California's RPS that requires California's investor-owned electric utilities to obtain 20 percent of the electricity that they supply by 2010 from renewable sources;

- Executive Order S-14-08, which established the RPS targets for California that "all retail sellers of electricity shall serve 33 percent of their load with renewable energy by 2020";

- Executive Order S-03-05 on climate change to advance renewable energy and other solutions to reduce California's GHG emissions; and

- The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) that established a comprehensive program of regulatory and market mechanisms to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020.

Project 1 includes various project design features and objectives that address global climate change and reduce GHG emissions, as do each of the Projects 1-6. Project design features include aspects of the Project that either must be incorporated as part of the conditions of approval, or that the Applicant has committed to include to reduce GHG impacts associated with the Project. The Projects would be designed to reduce emissions through specific goals set. The expected Project features would directly or indirectly result in lower emissions of GHGs. The Project design features that address global climate change impacts include the following:

- Vegetation to sequester GHGs
    - Preserve natural areas by mowing, which maintains the organic material in the soil
    - Preserve open space by limiting constructing on portions of Project site
    - Plant trees and shrubs along the edges as buffers to adjacent receptors

- Construction limitations to minimize GHG emissions
    - Limit construction equipment idling beyond regulation requirements
    - Limit number of simultaneous construction projects by phasing

As such, Project 1 would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation to reduce GHG emissions. **(DEIR at 4.7-30)**. In addition to the Project design features listed above, the Project's impacts related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

GHG-1 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.

GHG-2 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not idle more than five minutes in any one hour.

GHG-3 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operations of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.

GHG-4 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.

GHG-5 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.

2.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant effect on Hazards and Hazardous Materials if it would: create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment; emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses; be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; for a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires, due to location within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4); expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, due to location within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires due to location within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires due to location within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard; or constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 1 would not require extensive or ongoing use of hazardous materials. Hazardous materials used during the construction of Project 1 would be typical of most construction projects of this type. Hazardous materials used during construction activities may include gasoline, diesel fuel, oils, lubricants, solvents, detergents, degreasers, paints, and other supplies. All hazardous materials would be transported, stored, and properly disposed of in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. The accidental release of hazardous materials or wastes during construction activities is possible. The accidental release of hazardous materials or wastes would be promptly contained and abated in accordance with all applicable laws and regulatory requirements, and therefore is not expected to result in a significant impact. **(DEIR at 4.8-11)**. During operation of Project 1, limited quantities of hazardous materials would be stored on-site. These materials would include fire suppressant and transformer insulating oil (mineral oil). The mineral oil would be contained within Project 1 electrical transformers and switches. Project 1 would develop and implement a hazardous materials and hazardous waste management program for both construction and operational phases. The program would include the following, as required by applicable regulations. **(DEIR at 4.8-11)**.

- **Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste Handling:** The construction contractor would prepare a Project-specific hazardous materials management and hazardous waste management program for Project 1. This program would be implemented prior to the start of construction activities. The program would prescribe proper hazardous material use, storage, and disposal requirements, as well as hazardous waste management procedures. The program would identify specific types of hazardous materials to be used during Project 1 construction and operation, and specific types of wastes that will be generated. All personnel would be provided with Project-specific training. These programs would be developed to ensure that all hazardous materials and hazardous wastes would be handled and disposed of in a safe and environmentally sound manner consistent with all applicable laws and regulations. Employees and contractor personnel handling wastes would receive hazardous materials training and be trained in hazardous waste procedures, spill contingencies, waste minimization procedures and treatment, storage, and disposal facility ("TSDF") training in accordance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration ("OSHA") Hazard Communication Standard and 22 CCR. Prior to the start of construction of Project 1, a Hazardous Materials Business Plan ("HMBP") will be prepared and submitted in accordance with Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code and Title 22 CCR, as required by the Certified Unified Program Agency.

- **Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan:** The construction contractor would prepare a site-specific SWPPP for review and approval by the appropriate regulatory agencies and implement it prior to the start of demolition or construction activities at Project 1. The SWPPP would utilize BMPs to address the storage and handling of hazardous materials and sediment runoff during demolition and construction activities.

- **Transport of Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Wastes:** Hazardous materials transported by truck would include fuel (diesel fuel and gasoline) and oils and lubricants

for equipment. Transportation of hazardous waste may include hazardous building materials and small amounts of construction waste such as waste oils, solvents, or cleaners. The construction contractor would prepare written procedures for the transport of hazardous materials and hazardous waste in accordance with the California Vehicle Code, California Highway Patrol Regulations (CCR Title 13); Department of Transportation Regulations, Title 49, CFR; and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regulations, Title 40 CFR, and CCR 22 regulations prior to the start of construction activities at Project 1.

- **Fueling and Maintenance of Construction Equipment:** The construction contractor would prepare written procedures for the fueling and maintenance of construction equipment prior to the start of construction activities at Project 1. Vehicles and equipment would be refueled off-site or on-site by refueling trucks. If on-site refueling or maintenance activities are required, refueling and maintenance procedures would include implementation of BMPs to ensure that chemicals do not come in contact with the ground. Equipment will be inspected daily for potential leakage or failures.

- **Emergency Release Response Procedures:** The construction contractor would prepare an Emergency Release Response Plan ("ERRP") detailing the response to releases of hazardous materials. The ERRP would be prepared prior to the start of construction activities at Project 1. The ERRP would prescribe hazardous materials handling procedures for reducing the potential for a release during construction activities, and would include an emergency response program to ensure the rapid and safe cleanup of any accidental spills. All hazardous material spills of threatened release would be immediately reported. All construction and operations personnel would be aware of federal, state, and local emergency response reporting guidelines. Implementation of the aforementioned hazardous materials and hazardous waste management programs would reduce the potential impacts associated with the handling, transport, and use of hazardous materials during both construction and operation of Project 1 to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.8-12)**.

If lead based paint is found during construction of Project 1, the Applicant would comply with County requirements and provide a copy of the qualifications/license of the lead based paint abatement contractor that will perform the abatement or removal of lead based paint to the Department of Public Works Building and Safety Division and the County of Los Angeles Fire Department Health and Hazardous Materials Division. If required by the County, the Applicant would prepare and submit a Hazardous Building Materials Demolition Assessment and Management Plan to the Department of Public Works and Fire Department for review and approval to ensure compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local laws, and regulations. OSHA regulations are in place to assure that these materials are safely removed prior to or during demolition and renovation activities. In compliance with regulations requiring removals by firms and individuals licensed to do such work pursuant to applicable regulations the Project's potential impacts regarding lead exposure would be less than significant. Implementation of the aforementioned ERRP would reduce the potential impacts associated with upset and accidental release conditions at Project 1 (and gen-tie lines) to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.8-13)**.

Project 1 would convert sunlight directly into electrical energy without the creation of hazardous emissions, and no impact to sensitive land uses would occur as a result of hazardous emissions. The primary emissions created by Project 1 (and gen-tie lines) would be air emissions from vehicle and equipment exhaust generated during construction activities. Potential impacts due to air emissions created during construction and maintenance activities at Project 1 would be less than significant, as discussed in Section 4.3 of the DEIR. **(DEIR at 4.8-13)**.

Based on the Environmental Data Review ("EDR"), the location of Project 1 and the Project 1 gen-tie line is included on a list of hazardous materials sites complied pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The location of Project 1 was indicated to contain a 500 gallon underground storage tank ("UST"). Prior to the start of construction activities at Project 1, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment ("Phase I ESA") would be conducted to evaluate the potential hazards associated with the previously abandoned UST located at the Project 1 site. A closure permit for the UST will be verified or obtained from the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Health Hazardous Materials Division. Based on the information compiled in the Project 1 EDR, potential Project 1 impacts due to site hazards to the public and environment would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.8-14)**.

Project 1 and gen-tie lines are not located within an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public use airport. Therefore, Project 1 would have no impact on public use airports. **(DEIR at 4.8-15)**. Project 1 is located approximately 2 miles northwest of the Little Buttes Antique Airfield Airport, which is a privately-owned dirt airstrip. Little Buttes Antique Airfield Airport has not adopted a land use plan. Project 1 is not expected to significantly alter surrounding land use or result in the construction of features greater in height than those already present in the surrounding areas. The solar generating facilities would introduce minimal amounts of glare to the existing landscape. The PV modules are designed to absorb sunlight, and the glass modules that protect the PV surface are typically formulated glass designed to allow sunlight to pass with minimal reflection. As stated in DEIR Section 4.1 Aesthetics, construction activities would be limited to daylight hours and any lighting that may occur would be in compliance with the requirements of the Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Therefore, the Project 1 impacts on people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.8-16)**.

Emergency response and evacuation procedures for Project 1 would be coordinated by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department ("LACSD") and the Los Angeles County Fire Department ("LACFD"). During Project 1 construction activities, the LACSD and LACFD require that adequate vehicular access be provided and maintained. The Traffic Control Plan for Project 1 would provide for the required access of emergency vehicles during construction activities. During operation of Project 1, Project operation staff would work with both the LACSD and the LACFD to ensure adequate emergency procedures are in place. The HMBP would include an Emergency Response Plan. Additionally, an Emergency Action Plan and a Fire Prevention Plan would be prepared for Project 1 as required by Cal/OSHA. These plans would ensure that Project 1 would have established plans and procedures for responding to emergency situations, and would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, Project 1 impacts to emergency

response plans or emergency evacuation plans would be less than significant during both construction and operations. **(DEIR at 4.8-17)**.

Project 1 is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. No impact would occur in this regard. **(DEIR at 4.8-17)**. A public water system for fire control does not exist near Project 1. The facility design includes a dedicated 10,000-gallon fire water storage tank to be installed and maintained at Project 1, in compliance with LACFD Regulation 19 and other applicable Fire Department water tank specifications. Because the SGF design includes a dedicated fire water tank meeting Fire Department requirements, the water and pressure would meet fire flow needs. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.8-18)**.

Project 1 is surrounded by rural agricultural lands with no industrial uses, manufacturing uses, or other particularly high fire hazard uses in the vicinity. Project 1 would comply with all applicable Fire Code and County and City ordinance requirements, and fire safety standards, as stated in DEIR Section 4.12 Public Safety. A Fire Management Plan, which would be prepared for Project 1, establishes standards and practices that would minimize the risk of fire and, in the event of fire, provide for immediate suppression and notification. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.8-18)**.

Project 1 will convert sunlight into electrical energy through a process which would not constitute a fire hazard. All materials and equipment used in the construction of each facility would be specified based on applicable codes and building regulations. Welding activities may also potentially result in the combustion of brush and vegetation. A Fire Protection and Prevention Plan would reduce these potential impacts to less than significant. A Fire Prevention Plan would be prepared for Project 1 as required by Cal/OSHA, and Project 1 would include a dedicated 10,000- gallon fire water storage tank in compliance with LACFD Regulation 19. Therefore, Project 1 does not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard, and would have a less than significant impact on fire hazards in the area. **(DEIR at 4.8-19)**.

Project 1 impacts related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

HH-1 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Materials Management and Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.

HH-2 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.

HH-3 Prior to the start of construction activities on the parcel containing the historic UST at the location of Project 1, a Phase I ESA will be completed. This mitigation measure only applies to Project 1.

HH-4 Prior to the start of construction activities, a closure permit for the UST will be verified or obtained from the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Health Hazardous Materials Division. This mitigation measure only applies to Project 1.

HH-5 Construction activities shall be halted if previously unidentified soil contamination is observed or indicated by testing during any earthwork activities. Construction will be halted or redirected until such soil contamination is evaluated and disposed of and/or treated.

2.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a potentially significant impact on Hydrology and Water Quality if it would: violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted; substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality; conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52); result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance; use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course); otherwise substantially degrade water quality; place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, or within a floodway or floodplain; place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; or place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

A Notice of Intent form would be submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board ("SWRCB") to apply for coverage under the NPDES General Permit for construction of Project 1. During construction, Project 1 would implement BMPs as specified in the site-specific SWPPP. The SWPPP would be developed by a State of California certified Qualified SWPPP Developer ("QSD") and during construction monitored by a State of California certified Qualified SWPPP Practitioner ("QSP"). The SWPPP would be approved by the County and uploaded to the State via the State SMARTs system prior to Project 1 ground-breaking. The SWPPP would identify construction-phase BMPs to be implemented. With implementation of the BMPs, Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines would only have the potential to generate less than significant effects on groundwater and/or stormwater runoff, and will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction. **(DEIR at 4.9-34; 4.9-38)**.

During Project 1 operations, mechanical equipment on the solar farm would either be made of pollutant free materials or fitted with special containment units to house any possible drips or spills of lubricants, oils, or other chemicals. Maintenance activities, including solar array washing, would be performed with clean water and allowed to evaporate or drip to the ground. Maintenance and operations personnel would be required to maintain all necessary spill prevention, control, and countermeasures on hand during site visits. These spill response kits would include, but are not limited to, personal protective equipment, spill pads, absorbents, booms, shovels, garbage bags, plastic sheeting, and disposal drums. Permanent treatment BMPs would include infiltration basins to preserve water quality. With these spill prevention, control, and countermeasures on-site, there would be a less than significant impact on groundwater and stormwater runoff quality, and Project 1 will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during operation. **(DEIR at 4.9-34; 4.9-38).**

As stated in Section 4.14.5 of the DEIR, water would be required for dust control measures during the duration of construction efforts. An analysis of the water supply, including the use of well water, is presented in DEIR Section 4.14 Utilities and Service Systems. At the outset of construction, water would be supplied via truck to meet the demands of Project 1. Well water is not considered available at this time, and would be reevaluated upon a change in status. The demands of Project 1 are anticipated to have a less than significant impact on the region's groundwater supplies. Furthermore, construction activities are not anticipated to interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. As stated in Section 4.14.5 of the DEIR, water may be required in the first few years of operation to establish the mature vegetation planted after construction. Similar to the construction period, water would be supplied via truck to Project 1. The volume of water required would be considerably less than the water required for construction activities. Well water would be considered if its availability changes. As with construction, impacts to the region's groundwater supplies are anticipated to be less than significant with operation of Project 1. Also, the effect on groundwater recharge by the development's increase in impervious surface will be mitigated by the proposed infiltration basins. These infiltration basins will allow the increase in runoff volume from the proposed development (up to the 25-year storm event) to infiltrate on-site and recharge the groundwater basin. Therefore, less than significant impacts to groundwater recharge are anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-35)**.

During construction of Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines, soils would be disturbed through activities such as minor grading and vegetation removal, which could lead to issues with soil erosion and siltation on- and off-site. Through the implementation of construction control measures per California Association of Stormwater Quality Agencies ("CASQA") standards (silt fencing, fiber rolls, and sandbag barriers), Project 1 would have less than significant impacts on erosion and debris deposition during construction (CASQA 2003). Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines would require minor grading on-site which would not drastically change the existing drainage patterns or natural channels. Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan ("SUSMP")/Low Impact Development ("LID") Reports would help account for the increase in runoff erosion capabilities resulting from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces. The infiltration basins would help reduce flow velocities and the sediment load of the runoff, which would lower the erosion and siltation capabilities of the runoff. Therefore, Project 1 would result in less than significant impacts to erosion and siltation on- and off-site. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines would require minor grading on-site, which would not drastically change the existing drainage patterns or natural channels. The increase in runoff flow rates and volumes from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces would be addressed by Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7. The infiltration basins, created by elevated road sections, would capture the increase in runoff volume (up to the 25-year storm event) and allow it to infiltrate on-site. The remaining runoff would flow over the road section and return to pre-development flow conditions before leaving the project site. With this measure, less than significant impacts would occur related to flooding on- and off-site. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7 would address the increase in runoff flow rates and volumes from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces. The infiltration basins, created by elevated road sections, would capture the increase in runoff volume (up to the 25-year storm event) and allow it to infiltrate on-site. The remaining runoff would flow over the road section and return to predevelopment flow conditions before leaving the Project site. The basins would be placed within the first half of the site to allow flows over the roads sections enough time to normalize before leaving Project 1. Project soils would treat the captured runoff at the infiltration basins. Therefore, less than significant impacts to existing or planned stormwater drainage systems are anticipated. Also, significant impacts to polluted runoff are not anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines would incorporate Los Angeles County LID standards, while following the requirements of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works ("LACDPW"). Existing on-site drainage patterns and channels would not be significantly altered by the Projects' minimal grading, and all off-site drainage patterns and channels would not be significantly impacted either. Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7 would allow the developments' increase in runoff (up to the 25-year storm event) to be both infiltrated and treated on-site. This also minimizes downstream impacts by returning to predevelopment flow conditions. Therefore, Project 1 will not conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance. **(DEIR at 4.9-38)**.

Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines are not in the vicinity of any SWRCB-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated. During construction, wastewater treatment systems would not be necessary. The Projects would contract services to supply and maintain portable toilets. Therefore, the impacts of Project 1 to the quality of groundwater and surface water would be less than significant during construction. The same portable toilet services would be contracted for operations. Temporary portable toilet services would be delivered during the required maintenance periods on an as needed basis. As a result, there would be less than significant impacts to the water quality of groundwater and surface water during Project 1 operations. **(DEIR at 4.9-39)**.

Project 1 does not involve the construction of housing. Therefore, no housing will be placed within a 100-year flood hazard area, and no impacts are anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-39)**.

Project 1 is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain, or within the immediate vicinity of any levees or dams which would place people or structures at risk of significant loss, injury or death in the event of a failure. In the event of a failure of the aqueduct near Project 1, the distance between the site and the aqueduct would allow the flow to dissipate. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated. The slopes of the Project 1 site are very mild, with slopes of less than 2 percent. Therefore, high mudflow conditions are not anticipated, and any mudflow conditions are expected to have a less than significant impact. Accordingly, Project 1 will not place structures in an area subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow. **(DEIR at 4.9-40)**.

Project 1 impacts related to Hydrology and Water Quality are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

HYDRO-1 Education and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants and Employees. Appropriate educational materials and training for preventing stormwater pollution and additional BMP Fact Sheets from the California Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks can be found at www.cabmphandbooks.com. Practical information material will be provided to employees on general good housekeeping practices. These materials will describe, but are not limited to, spill prevention and control and the use of chemicals, petroleum products, pesticides and fertilizers that should be limited to the property, with no discharge of wastes directly or indirectly to gutters, catch basins or the storm drain system. Information will be distributed directly to the employees as well as being posted in public areas. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities. The required materials shall be available at each project site and a log kept to show education has occurred prior to the start of construction.

HYDRO-2 A spill contingency plan will be prepared by the owner/building operator. As a minimum the Spill Contingency Plan will "mandate the stockpiling of cleanup materials, notification of responsible agencies, disposal of cleanup materials and documentation." This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-3 No hazardous materials are anticipated to be stored on-site. If hazardous materials are required to be stored on-site, a designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in accordance with requirements of the Health & Safety Code and store the materials according to applicable regulations. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-4 A designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in compliance with the current requirements of the County of Los Angeles Fire Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-5 Site waste receptacles shall be emptied on a weekly basis or more often to prevent containers from overflowing. Upon inspection any debris or rubbish will be picked up and the site cleaned. The trash area is NOT to be cleaned by hosing down. The type of materials used to clean the area and storage of said materials will be determined by the Contractor. Signage will be posted that lids shall be kept closed at all times. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 at all times during facility operations.

2.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant effect related to Land Use and Planning if it would: physically divide an established community; be inconsistent with applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans; be inconsistent with the zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject properties; or conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria.

Finding:

Project 1 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Land Use and Planning. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 1 is located within a sparsely populated area, and is not located within any established community. Project 1 is located in an area that has been characterized by agricultural uses for several decades, and has been in transition to residential uses or vacant land. Project 1 would not physically alter the community, would not divide any community, or change any public access routes to them. Impacts would be considered to be less than significant. Likewise, Project 1's proposed gen-tie lines would not result in physical improvements that would result in dividing an established community, and the proposed gen-tie line would be located within a public right-of-

way or an easement on private land. Therefore, Project 1 would not divide an established community, and impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.10-36)**.

Project 1 is not located within the boundaries of a Community Standards District; therefore, no district development standards apply to Project 1. The Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan designates the Project 1 site as N-1, Non-Urban use. According to the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, allowable uses in the N-1 designation include utility installations (County of Los Angeles 1986). Project 1 is considered a utility installation, and therefore would be consistent with the N-1 land use designation. As a result, Project 1 would be consistent with the General Plan Land Use designation. Development of Project 1 will be consistent with permissible uses associated with the land use designation and the policies, goals, and objectives outlined in the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, and will not be inconsistent with any applicable County plan. **(DEIR at 4.10-36)**.

The gen-tie lines for Project 1 are linear infrastructure that would not result in any changes to the existing land use patterns in the area of Project 1. The gen-tie lines would be located underground within Los Angeles County to the extent practicable, and aboveground within the City of Lancaster, either in a public road ROW or on private lands adjacent to the public road ROW. Within the City of Lancaster, the gen-tie line routes would traverse land use designations "NU" Residential and "UR" in the City of Lancaster. According to the County's Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, allowable uses in the N-1 designation include utility installations. Additionally, the City's NU land use designation permits solar generating facilities and utility installations within its designation. In July 2013, the City approved a General Plan Amendment for the UR designation to NU designation for another applicant's solar project that the gen-tie line would traverse to connect to the Antelope Substation. A franchise agreement will be obtained by the Applicant with the City of Lancaster for the gen-tie line that will traverse through this jurisdiction. This agreement will grant a utility franchise and right of way privileges for the proposed gen-tie line. Therefore, no impact to County and City Plans would occur**.** Project 1 would not be located within the Fox Airfield's airport influence area. Therefore, this Plan is not applicable to Project 1, and there would be no impacts. **(DEIR at 4.10-37)**.

The County's CUP entitlement process involves the discretionary review of a project, whereby conditions of approval for Project 1 would be assigned. A CUP Burden of Proof is required to be submitted to determine Project 1's consistency with the General Plan, compatibility with surrounding land uses, conditions to ensure compatibility, land suitability and physical constraints, project design, availability of adequate access, public services and facilities to serve the development, and identify potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures. As shown in DEIR Tables 4.10-1, 4.10-2, and 4.10-3, Project 1 is consistent with County land use designations and compatible with adjacent and surrounding land uses. (DEIR at 4.10-43). The implementation of the environmental mitigation measures and CUP conditions would be expected to minimize Project 1's potential impacts, such that the Project could occur while maintaining zoning compliance within the designated zone. As a result, Project 1 would be consistent with the County's zoning designations. Permitting processes for those portions of the gen-tie lines located in the City of Lancaster would require necessary approvals from the City. Compliance with applicable City zoning regulations and conditions would ensure consistency with City's zoning designations. **(DEIR at 4.10-38)**.

Project 1 and lands adjacent to its associated gen-tie line ROW are zoned Light Agriculture (A-1), which does not permit electric generating facilities within this zone. A zone change from A-1 to Heavy Agriculture (A-2) is part of the County approvals. Under the jurisdiction of the County of Los Angeles, electric generating plants and transmission lines are allowed in A-2 zones with issuance of a CUP. The proposed Project 1 gen-tie line would be constructed underground within Los Angeles County unless other applicable regulations require above-ground installation. The gen-tie line would be located on private lands adjacent to the public road ROW or within the public road ROW. It is a linear component that would not result in any changes to the existing land use patterns in the area, and would be permitted as part of the CUP. As discussed above, a CUP for the Project would be required by the County of Los Angeles under the A-2 zoning designation. Therefore, Project 1 and the associated gen-tie line would result in a less than significant impact relative to the subject proposed A-2 zoning in Los Angeles County. **(DEIR at 4.10-38)**.

As discussed in DEIR Section 4.4 Biological Resources, Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines are not located within a designated SEA; therefore, SEA conformance criteria do not apply. Additionally, no local community conservation plans that could contain applicable land use criteria apply to Project 1 or its associated gen-tie lines. Project 1 would not be located within a Hillside Management Area, and would not conflict with any Hillside Management criteria. **(DEIR at 4.10-39)**.

Project 1 is located within an Agricultural Opportunity Area, as discussed in Section 4.2 of the DEIR. Project 1 would generate electrical power through renewable solar PV technology which is an allowable use with a CUP and where necessary, a zone change. Project 1 would involve conversion of land that was formerly used for agricultural production to renewable energy production. Construction and operation of Project 1 would not involve other restrictions, obstructions, or resources that could result in conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use. Additionally, Project 1 would be located on fallow land that is currently not irrigated, with surrounding parcels being mostly undeveloped and fallow agricultural land. Project 1 would produce power in a passive manner and would result in minimal air emissions, traffic, and noise, and would not affect adjacent agricultural operations. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.10-40)**.

Project 1 contains no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as discussed in DEIR Section 4.2 Agriculture and Forestry. Therefore, Project 1 will have no impact to Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. **(DEIR at 4.10-40)**. Project 1 is not located within a Noise Management Area. **(DEIR at 4.10-41)**.

Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines are located within the 500-year floodplain Zone X (Unshaded). These areas are known to be of a very low flood risk. All of the Project 1 area would be developed, and measures would be taken in the design of the site's solar panels to account for the flood hazards. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.10-41)**.

2.11 NOISE

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant Noise impact if it would: result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the project; result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; for a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels; or, for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Noise.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Sound generated from Project 1 would consist of: (1) short duration sounds resulting from construction activities, and (2) sound during normal facility operations. Vibration from Project 1 would only result during construction. Construction activities would take place only during daytime hours. An evaluation of expected noise and vibration levels was performed, and the ability of Project 1 to comply with applicable noise requirements was assessed.

For Project 1, the following criteria were determined to be inapplicable or to result in no impact:

- Exposure of on-site workers to noise levels that exceed occupational safety standards (90 dBA as a time-weighted 8-hour average or peak noise levels above 115 dBA).

- Exposure of residents to airport or private airstrip-related noise levels above a CNEL of 65 dBA.

Occupational noise exposure is governed by federal and state regulations. Cal/OSHA administers industrial safety regulations in California. Cal/OSHA regulations establish a time-weighted noise exposure limit of 90 dBA averaged over 8 hours (CCR, Title 8, Article 105). Noise source controls, administrative procedures, or worker hearing protection must be provided if worker noise exposure would exceed the 90 dBA limit. The construction contractor selected for the Project would be required to follow Cal/OSHA requirements for construction worker noise exposure. **(DEIR at 4.11-25)**.

Project 1 construction would take place between the third quarter of 2014 and the second quarter of 2015. Sound from construction equipment would vary dependent on the construction phase and the number and class of equipment at a location at any given time. **(DEIR at 4.11-26)**. Prior to commencement of construction, Project 1 will be required to obtain a variance from the County's noise ordinance (as described under Section 12.08 of the Los Angeles County Code), because the pile driving will last for more than ten days. Generally, construction sound would attenuate with increased distance from the sound sources. Actual received sound levels would fluctuate, depending on the construction activity, equipment type, and separation distances between source and receiver. Construction noise is a temporary noise source that would only occur during daytime hours. Sound levels from construction are expected to be comparable to sound produced by farm machinery, such as equipment used in nearby agricultural fields. Worst case construction noise levels for the nearest residence would last no more than a few weeks, as construction activities progress across Project 1. Therefore, no one residence would be exposed to significant noise levels for any extended period of time. **(DEIR at 4.11-27)**.

Traffic noise generated during construction of Project 1 on and offsite would temporarily add to overall sound levels. As a general construction practice, functional mufflers would be maintained on all equipment to maintain noise levels as low as reasonably achievable. The Project 1 Applicant would make reasonable efforts to minimize noise resulting from construction activities, as described in Mitigation Measures N1- N6. With implementation of these measures, including the use of sound curtains or barriers during pile driving, construction sound levels would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-27)**.

Like noise from pile driving, vibration from pile driving would only last for a few weeks at most, and would move throughout the Project rapidly with no single noise sensitive receptor experiencing the peak 0.04 PPV for more than an few hours, and would not damage structures. Therefore, exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels due to the construction of Project 1 and the gen-tie line will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-48)**.

Little Buttes Antique Airfield is two miles from Project 1, and Skyotee Ranch Airport is located 4.6 miles from Project 1. Both have very low use levels. No airfield noise contours have been developed for Little Buttes Antique Airfield and Skyotee Ranch Airport, but due to low operation levels and distance from the airports, sound levels at both airfields are assumed to be below 55 dBA CNEL. Project 1 would not create residential land uses, and all Project features are outside the airfield properties. Consequently, there are no impacts from airport-related noise. **(DEIR at 4.11-51)**.

Project 1 impacts related to Noise are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

N-1 Construction operations would not occur between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday, or at any time on Sunday with the exception of limited low-noise generating potential night work with Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning and Public Works approval.

N-2 Construction site and access road maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour shall be established and enforced during the construction period.

N-3 Electrically-powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, except for devices like trucks, loaders, dozers, and other heavy equipment.

N-4 Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far as practicable, and no closer than 1,000 feet, from noise-sensitive receptors.

N-5 The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells are prohibited except where required by OSHA or for safety or emergency warning purposes required by other regulatory agencies.

N-6 Project-related public address or music systems used on-site shall not be audible at any adjacent receptor.

N-7 All noise-producing construction equipment and vehicles using internal combustion engines shall be equipped with mufflers, air-inlet silencers where appropriate, and any other shrouds, shields, or other noise-reducing features in good operating condition that meet or exceed original factory specifications which are in compliance with any applicable legally required equipment noise standards. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors) shall be equipped with shrouds and/or other noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment. Mobile sound barriers with a sound transmission class of 19 or greater will be used for pile driving on Projects where received sound levels at the nearest noise sensitive receptor are predicted to be above the County construction noise limit of 60 dBA during the day. With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may need to incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including:

N-8 Siting substations to achieve National Electrical Manufacturers Association ("NEMA") sound ratings at sensitive receptors as described in Section 4.11.5.2 not to be closer to the property line of sensitive receptors than the following distances for each individual project:

- Project 1 – 325 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 74 dBA

N-9 The Applicant shall use NEMA low noise rated transformer equipment which will achieve 10 dBA or greater noise reduction as compared to standard NEMA-rated transformers of a similar size and rated capacity to ensure that Project noise impacts would be less than significant.

2.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant impact on Public Services if it would create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection; sheriff protection; schools; parks; libraries, or other public facilities.

Finding:

Project 1 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Public Services. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 1 is located within the LACFD Battalion 11 service area. Station 112, which is 3.8 miles southeast of Project 1, is the jurisdictional station (i.e. the first-responder) to respond to incidents at the site. Additional fire stations within Battalion 11 (identified in Table 4.12-1) would also potentially be dispatched to respond to fire protection needs at the site.

During construction, workers would be temporary and would not be expected to relocate to the Project 1 area as they would mostly be hired from the available local workforce and would not be expected to result in significant changes to the local population; therefore, the construction of Project 1 is not anticipated to create significant changes to the local population that would increase the level of demand on fire protection services or that would increase the level of demand on the fire department services such that additional staff would be needed. **(DEIR at 4.12-6)**.

As discussed in DEIR Section 4.13, Transportation and Traffic, construction of Project 1 would not result in significant traffic impacts. However, Project 1 would involve construction of an underground 0.54-mile gen-tie line along West Avenue B and an underground 0.02 mile gen-tie across 110th Street West. Transmission line construction would require work in the public road ROW, including limited encroachment into the traveled roadway. It is anticipated that the construction of the Project 1 gen-tie lines would only require partial street closures, which provide better emergency access than full street closures. Approvals for Project 1 will require worksite traffic control plans, permits, and coordination with County departments regarding potential construction impacts to West Avenue B and 110th Street West. Additionally, the LACFD Fire Stations 112, 130, and 78 would be notified at a minimum of three days in advance of any street closures that may affect fire/paramedic responses in the area. In the event that the Project 1 gen-tie line construction would require road closures, alternate route details (detour plans) and the schedule of closures would be submitted to the LACFD prior to construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TT-3 would minimize potential effects to West Avenue B and 110th Street West, such that the impact to LACFD access and response times would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-6)**.

Based on the Applicant's commitment to conformance of construction activities at the Project 1 site and gen-tie line ROW to federal, state, and Los Angeles County ordinances for fire protection, and implementation of mitigation related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials, construction would not be expected to result in significant special fire problems or hazards. Additionally, construction traffic at the site would not be anticipated to have a significant impact on local intersections and road segments. Therefore, Project 1 impacts to LACFD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-6)**.

Operations activities at Project 1 would typically be associated with routine maintenance carried out on-site and along the associated gen-tie ROWs at periodic intervals by a small maintenance crew. These activities would not result in effects to LACFD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection during operations of Project 1; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. In addition, the Applicant would be required to pay taxes as per the Proposition E Special Tax and property tax assessments, which are allocated to the LACFD. These taxes are designed to provide for potential increases in LACFD fire protection service demands to accommodate for new and existing developments. **(DEIR at 4.12-11).**

The Project 1 site is located within the LACSD Field Operations Region 1 service area. The Lancaster Station, which is approximately 12.4 miles southeast of Project 1, would likely be the first responder to incidents at the site. Currently the station maintains an officer-to-population service ratio of approximately 1 to 1,000. Project 1 does not involve any residential uses, and would not be considered to result in significant increases to population. During construction, workers would be temporary, and would not be expected to relocate to the area as they would mostly be hired from the available local workforce. The employees are planned to be hired from the available local workforce, and would not be expected to result in significant changes to the local population that would increase the level of demand on law enforcement services. **(DEIR at 4.12-11)**.

Sheriff services potentially required at Project 1 would likely include incidents of vandalism or theft. While these incidents would require sheriff services, they are not considered emergency response incidents, and as such would not affect emergency response times. As discussed in DEIR Section 4.13, Transportation and Traffic, construction of Project 1 would not result in significant traffic impacts. However, Project 1 would involve construction of an underground 0.5-mile gen-tie line on West Avenue B and an underground 0.02 mile gen-tie across 110th Street West, which may require work in the public road ROW, and may potentially encroach into the traveled roadway. As a result, it is proposed to require worksite traffic control plans, permits, and coordination with County departments regarding potential construction impacts to West Avenue B and 110th Street West. Implementation of this would be expected to minimize potential effects to West Avenue B and 110th Street West such that the impact to LACSD access and response times would be less than significant. As a result, construction of Project 1 would be expected to result in less than significant effects to LACSD services and response times, such that Project 1 would not require additional LACSD staffing. Therefore, impacts from the construction of Project 1 to LACSD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for sheriff protection would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-11)**. Likewise, impacts to LACFD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for sheriff

protection during operations of Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines are expected to be negligible. **(DEIR at 4.12-15)**.

Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines do not include residential development or the influx of long-term workers from outside the area, and accordingly would not generate population growth. Consequently, no new demands on school facilities, parks, library facilities or other public facilities are expected, and no impact would occur to these facilities. **(DEIR at 4.12-15; 4.12-16)**.

2.13 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant impact on Transportation and Traffic if it would: conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit; conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways; result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks; substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); result in inadequate emergency access; or conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Transportation and Traffic.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Traffic generated during the construction phase of Project 1 and its gen-tie line would include construction worker commuter trips, water truck trips, and delivery truck trips. Construction worker commuter trips and delivery truck trips are anticipated to arrive to the Project 1 site outside of peak hours. It is anticipated that 30 percent of water trucks would arrive to the Project site during the AM peak hour. Project 1 would have an average of 75 workers per day and a peak of 100 workers per day over a 20-day period during construction. For equipment and materials, Project 1 would have an average of 4 delivery truck trips per day with an expected peak of 26 delivery truck trips. It is anticipated that construction workers and delivery trucks would arrive to the Project 1 site outside of peak hours. **(DEIR at 4.13-28)**.

Dependent upon climatic conditions during construction, the maximum estimated water use for the Project 1 site is 50 acre-feet for Phase 1, and 50 acre-feet for Phase 2, which would be

obtained from an off-site provider. Potable water would be brought in to the Project 1 site for drinking and domestic needs. During the site preparation and site preparation activities, water would mainly be used for soil compaction and control of fugitive dust generation. Smaller quantities of water would also be required on an as-needed basis for preparation of the concrete required for foundations and other minor uses. Subsequent to these construction activities, water usage would primarily be used for on-going dust suppression associated with the remaining construction of Project 1. Project 1 would require a total of 10 daily water truck trips arriving on-site. Assuming that 30 percent of the water trucks would arrive on-site during the AM peak hour (7:00 AM), 3 water trucks would be used in this analysis. As shown in DEIR Tables 4.13-13 and 4.13-14, during the AM peak hour the local roads would experience a maximum increase in traffic volume of 18.75 percent. This is mainly due to the existing low volume and low peak traffic conditions for these roads, which are located in rural areas and operate well below the existing capacity of 1,600 vehicles per lane per hour for a 2-lane road. Therefore, these roads have adequate capacity to safely accommodate the increase from Project 1 water truck traffic, and would have a less than significant impact on the existing traffic conditions. **(DEIR at 4.13-28)**.

During construction of gen-tie lines associated with Project 1, it is anticipated that temporary, one-lane road closures would be necessary. A Project Traffic Plan would be prepared to address the temporary one-lane road closures and submitted to the County for approval prior to issuance/approval of the County Grading Permit as indicated in Mitigation Measure TT-2. Parking, temporary office trailers, and construction and PV equipment lay-down areas would be located entirely within the Project 1 site boundary. The construction impacts would be temporary and less than significant with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.13-29)**.

The operational phase of Project 1 is anticipated to only generate an average of 2 additional vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours on a quarterly or as-needed basis with a maximum of 10 additional trips, which would only occur when panel washing operations are being conducted. Based on the traffic analysis for the water truck trips described above, the operational phase vehicle trips are considered negligible. Therefore, no additional post-construction operational analysis was conducted. The operational phase of Project 1 would have a less than significant impact on the traffic and/or transportation infrastructure. **(DEIR at 4.13-29)**. Project 1 would not conflict with any applicable congestion management programs during the construction or operational phases. **(DEIR at 4.13-39)**.

Air traffic would not be impacted by implementation of Project 1. Project 1 would not include any buildings, structures, or other operations that would result in a change in existing air traffic patterns. The PV modules that would be used at Project 1 would be non-reflective, and would not pose a hazard to air traffic. Gen-tie line components would be below the height limit and would not result in a change in existing air traffic patterns. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.13-39)**.

No existing roads would be altered by Project 1, and Project 1 does not include design features or uses that would substantially increase any hazards. Parking, temporary office trailers, and construction and PV equipment lay-down areas would be located entirely within the Project 1 site boundary. Only temporary one-lane road closures are expected for the construction of the Gen-tie Lines. A Project Traffic Plan would be prepared to address the temporary one-lane road

closures and submitted to the County for approval prior to issuance/approval of the Grading Permit. Therefore, Project 1 would not result in inadequate emergency access. Project 1 is located in rural areas of Los Angeles County and would not significantly decrease the performance or safety of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. **(DEIR at 4.13-40)**.

Project 1 impacts related to Transportation and Traffic are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

TT-1 Prior to issuance of a grading permit, Applicant shall document and submit all required information and/or material pertaining to the pavement conditions of construction routes for the Projects, including the formula for calculation of the Projects' fair share of any repair or reconstruction of construction routes to the satisfaction of LACDPW. Applicant shall reimburse the County of Los Angeles for the cost of any repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes attributable to the Projects as agreed to by LACDPW. The timing of any necessary repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes and the required payment by the Applicant shall be determined by LACDPW.

TT-2 Prior to any construction activities and/or issuance of required encroachment permits from Los Angeles County, the Applicant shall prepare worksite traffic control plans for review and approval from LACDPW and other affected agencies for any closures, partial closures of public streets, or work within or adjacent to the road right-of-way that impacts the movement of traffic. The Plans shall be prepared in accordance with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (2012).

TT-3 Additionally, the County, including LACFD Fire Stations 78 (for R2011-00801) and 130 (for R2011-000798, 00799, 00805,00807, & 00833) shall be notified at least three days in advance of any street closures that may affect fire and/or paramedic responses in the area. The Applicant shall provide alternate route (detour) plans to the County, including three sets to LACFD, with a tentative schedule of planned closures, prior to the beginning of construction.

TT-4 Stagger construction work shifts before or after peak traffic hours.

TT-5 Schedule truck deliveries during off peak hours.

TT-6 Limit water truck deliveries during the AM peak hour to 30 percent of the daily water truck trips. All other trips shall be at off peak hours.

TT-7 Prior to start of construction activities, Applicant shall provide worker education encouraging carpooling and vanpooling by workers and shall provide assistance for organizing vanpools and carpools. A log will be developed to show compliance.

2.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant impact on Utilities and Service Systems if it would: exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards; create water or wastewater system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; create drainage system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; not have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses; create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; or create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Finding:

Project 1 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Utilities and Service Systems. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The construction of Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines would generate temporary and limited wastewater as a result of on-site construction workers. The wastewater generated would be collected at the on-site mobile sanitation facilities and then transported to a nearby wastewater disposal facility. In the event that additional wastewater is generated from construction activities, water would be stored in an on-site tank system and would be disposed of at an approved wastewater treatment facility. Construction and operational wastewater will be limited in quantity and significantly below wastewater treatment requirements of Los Angeles County and the RWQCB. **(DEIR at 4.14-14)**.

All wastewater would be treated according to the treatment requirements enforced by the NPDES permit authorized by the Lahonton Regional Water Quality Control Board ("LRWQCB"). Additionally, semi-annual washing of the PV modules would generate minimal wastewater during operation. However, since the wash water would only consist of demineralized water and dust washed off of the modules, it would not need to be treated at a wastewater treatment facility. This wash water would be allowed to infiltrate into the ground and evaporate as it drips off the PV modules. The wastewater generated from maintenance workers would be collected at the on-site temporary mobile sanitation facilities and then transported to a nearby wastewater treatment facility. Project 1 would not exceed the requirements of LRWQCB,

and therefore impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-14)**. Likewise, construction and operation of Project 1 would not exceed the capacity of any treatment plant and would have no impact to a wastewater system. Consequently, no new wastewater treatment facilities would need to be created and no existing facilities would need to be expanded. The maximum construction water use of Project 1 is 100 acre feet, and the maximum operational water use of Project 1 is 2.9 acre feet per year. No water system capacity problems would be created and no new water systems or expansion of existing systems would be required. **(DEIR at 4.14-15)**.

Project Site 1 currently drains from west to east; the post-development condition would maintain this flow path. A SWPPP incorporating BMPs for temporary stormwater management would be prepared and approved before the construction of Project 1 and its gen-tie lines. The final design of Project 1 would allow the pre-development runoff amount to continue to sheet flow in the post-development condition to avoid disturbance to downstream drainage structures or wildlife. The design of Project 1 would eliminate the need for new drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, Project 1 would have a less than significant impact on drainage facilities. **(DEIR at 4.14-18)**.

The construction for Project 1 and the Project 1 gen-tie lines would create a short-term temporary demand for water, primarily in association with dust control. The Applicant would provide a Dust Control Plan to the County prior to the start of construction activities. The plan would detail site-specific dust control measures designed to minimize water use during construction activities, while minimizing fugitive dust emissions. Project 1's maximum construction water use is 100 ac-ft, which is estimated for the span of approximately 5 months. The Project 1 site would have otherwise potentially required at least 624 ac-ft of water per year for agricultural use. Based on potential estimated historic groundwater use at the site, there may be adequate groundwater supply within the western portion of the Basin to meet Project 1's construction water needs. In addition, according to the Antelope Valley Integrated Regional Water Management Plan ("IRWMP"), groundwater is considered a reliable water source in the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin.

However, given that the Adjudication will not likely be resolved during construction of Project 1, water for Project 1 would be supplied via truck from either Homer LLC, or the City of Lancaster, both of which have provided "Will Serve" letters indicating their ability to meet the water demands of Project 1. Homer LLC would provide out-of- Basin water stored in the Antelope Valley Water Bank. Potential recycled water providers are Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40, Los Angeles County Sanitation District, and Palmdale Water District. The City of Lancaster has a current supply capacity of approximately 16 million gallons per day of treated wastewater that is suitable for construction use and panel washing. **(Final EIR at p. 256)**.

As previously discussed, the potential estimated historical agricultural water usage for the Project 1 site was determined to be at least 624 AFY. Project 1's maximum construction water use is 100 ac-ft over an approximately 5-month construction period, which equates to 92 percent less than the potential estimated historical annual agricultural groundwater usage at the site. Either of the sources noted above would have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the Project 1 construction demands from existing water source entitlements and water resources.

Therefore the impacts from water usage during construction would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-20)**.

During operations, the maximum water use for Project 1 would be 2.9 AFY. A maximum of 2.9 AFY of additional water may be needed in the first 2 years of operation to establish the plants for the landscaping buffer. It is unlikely but possible that additional water (up to 3 AFY) may be needed later during the operations phase for supplemental plantings if landscape vegetation expires and has to be replaced. As with the Project 1 water needs during construction, during operations Homer LLC would also provide out-of-Basin water stored in the Antelope Valley Water Bank. This option would provide a reliable source of water for operations. Potential recycled water providers are Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40, Los Angeles County Sanitation District, and Palmdale Water District. The City of Lancaster has a current supply capacity of approximately 16 million gallons per day of treated wastewater that is suitable for construction use and panel washing. **(Final EIR at p. 256)**. Therefore, the impacts from water usage during operations would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-20)**.

Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines do not require natural gas or propane during construction or operation; therefore there would be no system capacity problems for those utilities. Since natural gas and propane are not needed for Project 1, no new energy facilities would need to be created, and no existing facilities would need to be expanded. Project 1 may require electricity for the construction equipment and for lighting construction activities. The electricity would likely come from one of the existing SCE lines located on the west and south sides of the site. Electricity consumption during construction would be temporary, and would vary depending on the phase of construction. Overall, the construction of Project 1 would require limited electrical consumption that the existing electrical grid has capacity to serve. Therefore, Project 1 would have a less than significant impact on energy utility system capacity during construction. **(DEIR at 4.14-25)**.

Project 1 would also require electricity for ongoing maintenance operations, lighting, security systems, and other various operational needs. During daylight hours, the electricity needs for Project 1 would be supplied by Project 1's electricity generation. During non-daylight hours, the electricity needs for Project 1 would be provided by either backfeed from the electrical grid, through the proposed gen-tie, or through the existing SCE lines located on the west and south sides of the Project 1 site. Therefore, Project 1 would have a less than significant impact on energy utility system capacity. **(DEIR at 4.14-26)**.

Construction of Project 1 would require some earthwork, demolition of two existing buildings, removal of a broken-down structure, and installation of the SGF. Solid waste generated from construction of Project 1 and the Project 1 gen-tie lines may include paper, wood, glass, plastics from packing material, waste lumber, insulation, scrap metal and concrete, empty nonhazardous containers, and vegetation wastes. In accordance with Title 22 Chapter 22.52, 65 percent of construction and demolition debris would be recycled. Any material that cannot be recycled would be properly disposed of at a regional disposal facility. Any defective or broken solar modules would be returned to the manufacturer for recycling or recycled by the Applicant as possible. In accordance with Title 22 Chapter 20.87, the Applicant would prepare a Recycling

and Reuse Plan and progress reports to implement and document the Project's recycling practices. Therefore, Project 1 impacts on landfill and solid waste disposal capacity will be less than significant. Once the SGF is installed, there would be minimal waste generated during operations of Project 1, therefore Project 1 impacts on landfill and solid waste disposal capacity would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-26)**.

Non-hazardous waste generated during construction, operation, and decommissioning of Project 1 (and gen-tie lines) would be transferred by licensed waste hauling contractors and recycled or disposed of in compliance with local and state regulations. Hazardous wastes would be shipped offsite and treated or disposed in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations for hazardous waste management. The construction contractor would prepare a Project-specific hazardous materials management and hazardous waste management program for Project 1. Project 1 would have no impact relative to compliance with existing federal or state regulations pertaining to solid waste, because Project 1 would be required to comply with all relevant regulations during construction, operation and decommissioning. **(DEIR at 4.14-27)**.

SECTION 3.0 FINDINGS REGARDING CUMULATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH ARE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

Pursuant to Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines, the following findings and statements of fact identify potentially significant cumulative impacts and Project 1's incremental contribution to the impacts discussed in the Final EIR, in the context of the other five Projects and other cumulative projects. For the following environmental resource areas, Project 1's incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable, and no cumulatively significant impact will occur.

3.1 AESTHETICS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Aesthetics.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Aesthetics.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Individually, with mitigation, each of the six proposed SGF Projects can each be expected to have a less than significant impact on aesthetic resources. The Project sites comprise 987.1 acres, or 0.6 percent of the total area within the 5 mile radius. Within the 5-mile radius area, there are 20,909 acres of development listed by individual projects, as shown in DEIR Table 3-7. These

development projects, including the Applicant's Projects, comprise 12.6 percent of the area identified in DEIR Figure 3-5 and include solar projects, commercial projects, and residential projects.

From elevated viewpoints, the western Antelope Valley appears as a mosaic of agricultural lands, suburban developments, and open land. From a distance, the proposed SGFs would not appear dissimilar to agricultural fields or existing PV facilities in shape and size. The other solar and real estate developments proposed for the western Antelope Valley would not appear dissimilar to existing land use patterns. From level viewpoints, such as those along local roads, solar or residential/commercial developments would not be prominent unless the observer is directly adjacent to the facility. Because of the flat nature of the Antelope Valley landscape, developments would quickly become less prominent as the viewer travels away from them. In addition, the scenic character on the valley floor is generally low. Existing commercial, residential, and energy developments (including substations, high-voltage transmission lines, distribution lines, and generation facilities) are scattered throughout the valley.

A 12.6 percent level of increase in development within 5 miles of each of the Project sites is not anticipated to be significant from elevated or level viewpoints, because the proposed developments would appear similar to existing developments in the Antelope Valley, and cover only a very small portion of the land within 5 miles of each proposed Project site. Views of open desert lands would still exist, and the flatness of the landscape would limit the prominence of new developments with increasing distance.

The proposed Projects and other proposed projects within the cumulative impacts study area would be individually required to comply with the Los Angeles County General Plan goals and policies, and the Antelope Valley Area Plan policies, as well as applicable ordinances such as the Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance, as they are applicable to aesthetic resources, as identified in Section 4.1.3 of the DEIR. Any cumulative aesthetic impacts would be reduced to a level that is less than significant with mitigation by application of these regulations, and mitigation measures A-1 to A-5. **(DEIR at 4.1-114 to 4.1-115)**.

3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Cumulative impacts to Agriculture and Forestry Resources could occur in the event that Project 1, in conjunction with the six proposed SGF Projects and other cumulative projects results in the area results in a cumulatively significant loss of Important Farmlands or Williamson Act contracted lands.

Finding:

Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Agriculture and Forestry Resources. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see DEIR Table 3-7). For the purposes of this cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable law ordinances regulations and standards.

Projects 1 – 6 are located in a region with significant agricultural uses. However, the Antelope Valley has been historically and is currently limited by water costs and climate conditions. Cumulatively, the Projects would not develop land classified as Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Project 4 is the only site that currently contains land designated as Prime Farmland and of Statewide Importance. As mentioned above, the DOC is in process of reclassifying Project 4 land currently mapped as Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance to Grazing Land on the 2012 edition of the Important Farmland Map for Los Angeles County. The Projects would not be expected to contribute to the overall trend of conversion of agricultural lands to other uses in the Antelope Valley when considered together with other potential cumulative projects in the area. That said, it is contemplated that at the end of the anticipated 35-year life of Projects 1-6, the associated properties could be returned to agricultural use. The Projects' incremental contribution to cumulative agricultural impacts is considered less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-9)**.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Air Quality.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Air Quality. Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Air Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Twenty-nine related projects have been identified within the proposed Projects' vicinity; locations are listed in DEIR Figure 4.3-2, "Cumulative Projects in the Region". Of these 29 related projects, there are a number of related projects that have not yet been built or are currently under construction. Since the Applicant has no control over the timing or sequencing of the related projects, and the level of emissions that would be generated by the related projects is uncertain, it is infeasible and speculative to prepare a quantitative analysis to ascertain daily construction emissions that would occur under a worst-case scenario of all 29 related projects being constructed concurrently with the Applicant's six Projects.

For this reason, the AVAQMD was consulted to assess the cumulative impact resulting only from the Applicant's six Projects. The County's EIR consultant (Tetra Tech) met with AVAQMD officials and technical staff at the AVAQMD's office on May 29, 2012, and discussed the proper cumulative Air Quality analysis methodology for the Project pursuant to CEQA. **(DEIR at 4.3-48)**. AVAQMD determined that cumulative impacts from the Applicant's six Projects should be cumulatively quantified based on size, construction equipment per phase, and construction phase duration, and that the related projects should only be qualitatively discussed within the EIR. The cumulative Air Quality analysis was performed based on the direction from AVAQMD, and included the analysis of concurrent construction and operation emissions sources on any one maximum construction day, air dispersion modeling method, and risk assessment method. **(DEIR at 4.3-48)**.

As previously discussed in the analyses above (DEIR Table 4.3-13, "Peak Annual Construction Emissions"; DEIR Table 4.3-20, "Peak Annual Operation Emissions"; and DEIR Table 4.3-22, "Concurrent Health Risk Assessment"), emissions from overlapping construction phases of the Applicant's six projects would not exceed the AVAQMD thresholds on any maximum day or year during construction or operations. **(DEIR 4.3-30; 4.3-49)**.

With respect to the Project's construction-period air quality emissions and cumulative Basin-wide conditions, the AVAQMD has developed strategies to reduce criteria pollutant emissions outlined in the Air Quality Management Plan ("AQMP") pursuant to CAA mandates. As such, Project 1 would comply with AVAQMD Rule 403 requirements, and implement all feasible mitigation measures. In addition, Project 1 would comply with adopted AQMP emissions control measures. Per AVAQMD rules and mandates and the CEQA requirement that significant impacts be mitigated to the extent feasible, these same requirements (i.e., Rule 403 compliance, the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, and compliance with adopted AQMP emissions control measures) would also be imposed on construction projects Basin-wide, which would include each of the related projects mentioned below. **(DEIR 4.3-49)**.

By applying AVAQMD's cumulative air quality impact methodology, implementation of Projects 1 – 6 would not result in an addition of pollutants, such that considerable cumulative impacts in conjunction with related projects in the region would occur. Therefore, the emissions of nonattainment pollutants and precursors generated cumulatively by Projects 1 – 6 would be less than significant. Projects are deemed inconsistent with air quality plans when they result in population and/or employment growth that exceeds growth estimates in the applicable air quality plan. The SGF sites would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, which in this case is the Federal 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan (Western Mojave Desert Nonattainment Area). The Ozone Attainment Plan relies upon future year emission inventories consistent with California Air Resource Board ("CARB") and the adopted General Plan growth projections. As the proposed Projects are not part of an ongoing regulatory program, the AVAQMD recommends Project-specific air quality impacts be used to determine the potential cumulative impacts to regional air quality. As discussed above, peak daily emissions of operation-related pollutants would not exceed AVAQMD significance thresholds.

The combined Projects' emission estimates state that while Projects 1 – 6 would generate air emissions during construction and a minimal amount of GHG emissions during operations, the

Projects' incremental contribution, with mitigation, to cumulative air quality impacts do not exceed any air quality significance thresholds and would comply with the applicable AVAQMD AQMP. It should be noted that solar energy provided by the Projects is a much cleaner source of energy than traditional sources used for the generation of electricity, such as the burning of coal, fuel oil, or natural gas. Furthermore, since the percentage of GHG emissions generated by Projects 1 – 6 is so small; Projects 1 – 6 would provide a *de minimis* contribution to significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects in the region (as further discussed in DEIR Section 4.7, Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas). The Projects' emissions of non-attainment pollutants and precursors generated during operations with mitigation would not exceed the AVAQMD Project-level thresholds and are less than significant. As a result, Project-level emissions would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution, such that results in an increase in air pollutant emissions above those assumed in the regional AQMP. **(DEIR at 4.3-52)**.

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Biological Resources.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Biological Resources. Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Biological Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The total area included in the map in DEIR Figure 3-17 showing a 5.0 mile radius outward from each of the Project 1 – 6 solar sites comprises 165,349 acres. Solar development in the area is 8,086 acres (4.9 percent of the 165,349 acres shown in DEIR Figure 3-17). The Silverado Projects cover 987 acres (only 0.6 percent of the total area). Open space and wildlife mitigation lands would be acquired and preserved in perpetuity for Projects 1 – 6. Since the mitigation lands are intended to comprise higher quality wildlife habitat than those impacted by the Projects, impacts will be mitigated. The permanent nature of the land mitigation and preservation program to be implemented would assure that these new wildlife habitat mitigation lands would always be maintained and enhanced for wildlife values. Therefore, cumulative impacts from the Project would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.4-71)**.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Cultural Resources.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Cultural Resources. Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Cultural Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. As described above under impacts specific to Project 1, impacts related to cultural resources would be mitigated to less than significant levels, since the CRHR and NRHP eligible resources in the area would be avoided. Because impacts to cultural resources would be mitigated to less than significant through avoidance, Projects 1 – 6 would not result in an incremental increase in effects on cultural resources when combined with the other 29 projects. Therefore, no significant cumulative impacts would be expected to occur. **(DEIR at 4.5-35)**.

3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Geology and Soils.

Finding:

Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Geology and Soils. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). For the purposes of this

cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time.

It is assumed that construction of all of the cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards, and that geotechnical studies would be performed to assess and mitigate any geotechnical hazards associated with them; therefore, the cumulative projects would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects. It is also assumed that the cumulative projects would comply with all applicable erosion control and stormwater management laws, ordinances, regulations and standards, therefore the construction of the cumulative projects would not contribute to cumulative soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

Proposed Projects 1 – 6 would not expose the public to adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking because the Projects would be contained within a secure fenced area at each location and not open to the public. The potential for injury to workers is also quite low as they will not be on-site the majority of the time, and the likelihood that a seismic event would occur when workers are present is quite small. The Projects would also not result in significant soil erosion because the design and construction of the Projects' facilities would comply with all applicable building codes and standards established by regulatory agencies, including Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the CBC. The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would therefore not contribute incrementally to cumulative impacts resulting from other development within the 5-mile radius. **(DEIR at 4.6-27)**.

3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change. Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15355, a "cumulative impact" is an environmental effect that may result from the combination of two or more environmental effects associated with a proposed project, or from the combination of one or more project environmental effects with related environmental effects caused by other closely related projects. However, in the case of global climate change, the proximity of the Projects to other GHG-generating activities is not directly relevant to the determination of a cumulative impact. Although AB 32 sets statewide

targets for future GHG emissions, the scoping plan and other implementing tools of the law are clear that the reductions are not expected to occur uniformly from all sources or sectors. The conclusions related specifically to Project 1, above, highlights the manner by which the proposed Projects intend to meet many of these strategies.

Numerous options exist for project developers to reduce their contribution to city-, county-, and state-wide GHG emissions, while helping to meet the region's future housing, jobs, and infrastructure needs. However, it is not possible at this time to accurately quantify GHG emissions expected from the related Projects or the GHG reductions anticipated from the above-listed strategies. There is no certain basis for concluding that an emissions increase resulting from the Projects and the related Projects could cause a measurable increase in global GHG emissions sufficient to force global climate change due to the complex physical, chemical and atmospheric mechanisms involved in global climate change.

In addition, the emissions models used for Project-level evaluations do not fully reflect improvements in technology and other reductions in GHG emissions that are likely to occur pursuant to state regulations, such as AB 1493, SB 1368, AB 32, and Executive Order S-3-5, as well as future federal and/or state regulations. Therefore, it is not possible or meaningful to calculate emissions from each of the identified related Projects and compare that with a numeric threshold or reduction target. Projects 1-6 would be consistent with the state's goals in helping the state meet the RPS (DEIR Table 4.7-17), resulting in a GHG emission profile that is below established thresholds, and include implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-1 to GHG-5. Therefore, the Projects do not contribute considerably to cumulatively significant global climate change impacts. **(DEIR at 4.7-31)**.

3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see Table 3-7). For the purposes of this cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with

all laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. It is assumed that for each of the cumulative projects, Hazardous Materials Management Plans and Hazardous Waste Management Plans would be implemented, a SWPPP would be prepared, and all applicable environmental due diligence would be conducted (i.e., a Phase I ESA). If any of the cumulative projects are within an airport land use plan or airport influence area, the projects would obtain the appropriate authorizations and permitting from the respective Airport Land Use Commission. The cumulative projects would have a less than significant impact with mitigation to hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the land uses in the surrounding areas (primarily agricultural) and the limited amount and type of hazardous materials to be used as part of the proposed Projects 1 – 6, no significant incremental cumulative impacts associated with environmental safety are expected to occur as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed Projects 1 – 6. Regulations implemented by the Department of Toxic Substance Control ("DTSC"), LACSD, LACFD, and Cal/OSHA would require similar measures be applied to other developments in the region. Therefore, Projects 1 – 6 are not expected to result in significant incremental cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. **(DEIR at 4.8-19 to 4.8-20)**.

3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Hydrology and Water Quality. Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Project sites, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-3). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws ordinances regulations and standards. Projects located within 5 miles of the proposed Projects entail the geographic extent under consideration of cumulative impacts. The proposed Projects are six of several proposed renewable development projects that would impact existing and proposed land uses within the general Project area. As shown in DEIR Table 3-7 and DEIR Figure 3-17, the proposed Projects would entail approximately 0.60 percent of all proposed projects within a 5-mile radius.

All cumulative projects that may be approved and implemented would also assess potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality. The proposed Projects 1 – 6 were found to have less than significant impacts related to erosion, flooding, debris deposition, and stormwater quality, with no off-site impacts. Additionally, the proposed Projects would not result in any significant or unavoidable impacts and represent a small fraction of the total amount of lands affected by renewable projects and foreseeable projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects. Therefore, the proposed Projects would not be expected to significantly contribute to potential cumulative impacts associated with other projects in the Projects' region. **(DEIR at 4.9-45)**.

3.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Land Use and Planning.

Finding:

Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Land Use and Planning. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6. The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards. **(DEIR at 4.10-43)**.

Projects located within 5 miles of the proposed Projects entail the geographic extent under consideration of cumulative impacts. The proposed Projects are six of several proposed renewable development projects that would impact existing and proposed land uses within the general Project area. Similar potential impacts can result from these projects as from the Projects with respect to consistency with the subject general plan land use plans and policies, impacts to compatibility with surrounding land uses, and regulatory compliance with zoning ordinances. All cumulative projects that may be approved and implemented would also assess potential impacts related to land use and planning. The proposed Projects were found to have less than significant impacts related to compliance with County zoning, consistency with the County General Plan Land Use Plan intent and applicable land use conformance criteria, dividing an existing community, and with no significant impacts to the adjacent City of Lancaster. Additionally, the proposed Projects would not result in any significant or unavoidable land use impacts and represent a small fraction of the total amount of lands affected by renewable projects and foreseeable projects within a 5 mile radius of the Projects. Therefore, the proposed Projects would not be expected to significantly contribute to potential cumulative land use related impacts associated with other projects in the region. **(DEIR at 4.10-44)**.

3.11 NOISE

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative Noise impacts.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1, which mitigate or avoid significant Noise impacts. Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant Noise impact.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Two non-Applicant projects identified have the potential to result in cumulative construction noise impacts, due to the projects being located in relatively close proximity to the proposed Projects, but not close enough to result in vibration impacts. The Western Antelope Dry Ranch project (CUP 11-07) is located approximately 1-mile north of Project 2, and the High Desert LLC (CUP 10-03) project is located approximately 1-mile north of Project 4. These distances are close enough that construction noise could propagate out to distances near the Applicant's Projects, but are not close enough to potentially result in vibration impacts. The time period of construction for these two projects is unknown, but if construction were to overlap with construction of the proposed Projects, there is the potential for increased temporary noise levels at residences; however, none of the noise sensitive receptors that are located in close proximity to Project 4 are also located in close proximity to Antelope Solar 1 or Antelope Solar Farm projects. Therefore, sound levels from construction of the Projects would only be minimally increased (less than 1-2 dBA), or not at all, by simultaneous construction. Therefore, overall cumulative impacts of the proposed Projects 1 – 6 would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures N-1 to N-9. **(DEIR at 4.11-56)**.

3.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Public Services.

Finding:

Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Public Services. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Projects amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. It is assumed that for each of the cumulative projects, worksite traffic control plans, permits, and coordination with County departments regarding potential construction impacts would be implemented. **(DEIR at 4.12-16)**.

Projects 1 – 6 would not cause effects to result in significant demands to fire response times. Projects 1 – 6 would be designed with appropriate fire protection considerations, and would also result in less than significant impacts to staffing and response times. Furthermore, Projects 1 – 6 would be required to provide taxes to the County that are designed to address cumulative fire department needs associated with new and existing developments. Other developments in the vicinity of Projects 1 – 6 would also be required to pay taxes and fees to the County to provide for their potential increase to LACFD fire protection service demands (LACFD 2009). Additionally, all development in the area is subject to review and approval by the Fire Department. This ensures that all projects contain appropriate controls to reduce demand on the fire department. As a result, Projects 1 – 6 would be anticipated to result in less than significant incremental contributions to cumulative fire protection impacts. **(DEIR at 4.12-17)**.

Projects 1 – 6 would not cause effects to result in significant demands to sheriff staffing or response times. Projects 1 – 6 would also implement site security control, including 24-hour remotely monitored video cameras for security monitoring to prevent potential theft and vandalism activities. Additionally, a portion of Projects 1 – 6 taxes levied would be allocated to sheriff services. Other developments in the vicinity of Projects 1 – 6 would also be required to pay taxes that would be allocated to sheriff services. As a result, construction and operation of Projects 1 – 6 would be anticipated to result in less than significant incremental contributions to cumulative sheriff protection impacts. Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with sheriff services would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-17)**.

Because development of Projects 1-6 will not induce population growth, no direct or cumulative impacts to schools, parks, libraries or other public facilities will occur. **(DEIR at 4.12-15; 4.12-16)**.

3.13 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Transportation and Traffic.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1, which mitigate or avoid significant impacts to Transportation and Traffic. Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Transportation and Traffic.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Cumulative impacts for transportation and traffic are the combined effect of Projects 1 – 6 with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects (other projects). This Cumulative Impacts discussion addresses the cumulative impacts of the Applicant's Projects 1 – 6 and the other projects within a geographic radius of 5-mile radius of the Projects (Project Study Area), which could potentially coincide with the expected construction schedule of the Applicant's Projects. Based on evaluation of the Project Study Area and available data from Los Angeles County, there are 29 other projects that have the potential to contribute additional traffic volume within the vicinity of Projects 1-6.

Evaluation of the cumulative impacts within the Project Study Area was focused on the construction-phase traffic for Projects 1-6 and other projects within a 5-mile radius. As previously stated in the individual conclusions for Project 1 above, the operational phase for each Project is anticipated to only generate a maximum of 4 vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours on a quarterly or as-needed basis with a maximum of 12 additional trips, which would only occur when panel washing operations are being conducted. Based on the traffic analysis contained in the DEIR, the operational phase vehicle trips/traffic for the Projects are considered negligible and would not result in a significant cumulative impact on the traffic and/or transportation infrastructure in the Project Study Area. **(DEIR at 4.13-41 to 4.13-43)**.

3.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Utilities and Service Systems.

Finding:

Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Utilities and Service Systems. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis

assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, and regulations. Construction and operation of the cumulative projects would result in less than significant impacts to public facilities, which include electricity, gas, wastewater, and solid waste services. During construction, all cumulative projects would follow required measures to prevent construction interference to utility services, and would comply with recycling requirements to minimize solid waste disposal at solid waste facilities. During operation, the solar and wind generation projects would provide electricity, and would generate minimal amounts of solid waste. During operation, the non-solar/non-wind commercial and residential development projects would generate solid waste as would be expected from these residential and commercial uses; it is assumed that these project proponents have planned for and mitigated for the additional solid waste generation as appropriate.

The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would provide their own electricity for operational needs, no natural gas would be required for their operations, little wastewater (from panel washing) would be generated as part of the operations process, and very little solid waste would be generated. As a result, the total cumulative impacts to utility services would be less than significant, and the incremental contribution of Projects 1 – 6 to cumulative impacts related to utility services would be less than significant. Furthermore, because the Applicant has committed to using out of Basin water during construction and operations, Projects 1 – 6 would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to water supply impacts in the Basin, and would have no significant cumulative effect on water supply. **(DEIR at 4.14-28)**.

SECTION 4.0 FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

These Findings and Statements of Fact regarding project alternatives and certain mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR are set forth to comply with Section 21002 of the Public Resources Code and Sections 15091(a)(3) and 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines. Five alternatives to the proposed Project (consisting of Projects 1-6) described in the Draft EIR were analyzed and considered as follows: 1) No Project Alternative; 2) Lower Intensity Projects; 3) Select Other Project Sites Alternative; 4) Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative; and 5) Wind Energy Generation Alternative. These alternatives constitute a reasonable range of alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. For the reasons set forth below, Alternatives 1-5 are rejected as infeasible for the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations set forth below.

4.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Description:

Under the No Project Alternative, Project sites 1-6 would remain in their present condition with site conditions (i.e., fallow agricultural land) as they currently exist.

Finding:

The No Project Alternative is rejected as infeasible because it fails to meet the Project goals and objectives, and would not contribute to the State's ability to meet its near- and long-term renewable energy generation goals and objectives.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would not be approved or implemented under the No Project Alternative. The potential environmental impacts and benefits of the proposed Projects would not occur as a direct consequence of implementation under the No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative would involve taking no action to generate 172 MW of clean, renewable electrical power utilizing solar PV technology and to integrate the electrical output of the Projects into the electrical grid. This alternative would not allow one of the primary purposes of the proposed Projects which is to increase the output of renewable energy in support of the RPS, such that the State of California may meet its current and planned goals for increasing renewable generation at reasonable market rates.

The No Project Alternative assumes that the sites will remain as they currently exist (primarily fallow agricultural land) and no environmental impacts would result. In summary, the No Project Alternative is provided for comparative purposes to the proposed Projects 1 – 6. This alternative is incapable of meeting the stated goals and objectives of the Projects to provide 172 MW of renewable electric energy to utility providers, and does not contribute to the state's ability to meet its near-term and long-term renewable energy generation goals and objectives. **(DEIR 5-1 to 5-2)**.

4.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: LOWER INTENSITY PROJECTS

Description:

Under the Lower Intensity Projects Alternative, fewer than six sites would be developed, and the smaller projects would be developed in a size and configuration that would result in generation of fewer than 172 MW of electricity.

Finding:

The Lower Intensity Projects Alternative is rejected as infeasible because it partially fails to accomplish the goals of the proposed Projects, which are to provide 172 MW of clean, renewable electric energy using solar PV technology, and to deliver the electric output on a wholesale basis to utility providers.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Projects 1-6 are designed to meet the increasing demand for clean, renewable electrical power. Any reduction in the size of the effort results in a similar potential reduction in the reliance on foreign sources of fuel, the diversification of energy portfolios, the contribution to the reduction

of GHG emissions, and the generation of "green" jobs. It would also potentially reduce the contribution to the much needed on-peak power to the electrical grid in California.

The opportunity to develop solar power in Los Angeles County has a limited timeframe because the utility companies, which purchase the power, would purchase power from another entity if the proposed Projects are not completed in a timely manner. If Los Angeles County does not approve the six viable SGFs proposed here, the opportunity to contribute to the competitive solar generation business in the County will be further lost to other projects. The proposed Projects are well-positioned to compete in the industry, are comparatively environmentally superior to most other locations, and have good positions for PPAs and interconnection agreements. Additionally, any reduction of the megawatts produced from these Projects would further limit the County's contribution to the State's renewable energy production goals. These 5 to 52 MW Projects meet the utility industry needs for small projects, and any reduction of the respective Projects' size would jeopardize the success of the Projects. **(DEIR at 5-2)**.

4.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: SELECT OTHER PROJECT SITES ALTERNATIVE

Description:

Under the Select Other Project Sites Alternative, other properties could potentially be used for the six Project sites.

Finding:

The Select Other Project Sites Alternative is rejected, because this alternative would have the same or greater impacts to the environment as Projects 1-6, which can all be mitigated to below a level of significance.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

One key objective for the Project Applicant was to locate the Projects in an area with the following characteristics: (1) adequate solar radiation; (2) close proximity to interconnection locations for each solar site; (3) project sites with landowners who are willing to sell large enough parcels of land for solar generation at market price; (4) lack of threatened and/or endangered biological species on the site; (5) lack of nearby sensitive receptors or land uses to minimize potential conflicts with development (6) relatively flat sites that have previously been disturbed to minimize disturbance to native habitat and to minimize the need for site grading; (7) existing access to accommodate construction workforce needs; and (8) access to nearby workforce to minimize traffic and socioeconomic impacts. The Applicant performed in-depth analyses of over 10,000 acres of land in the Western Antelope Valley, as shown in DEIR Figure 6-1. Of the 10,000 acres screened, only ten percent met the criteria listed above.

The six Project sites selected and proposed by the Applicant are the most viable sites to develop solar electricity generation with minimal environmental impacts. These sites were also chosen for development based on interconnection capacity and requirements placed on the Applicant by the utility providers. Selection of other alternative sites would have the same or greater impacts

to the environment since the present Projects are the result of a long and intense effort by the Applicant to find and acquire the most suitable sites according to the criteria given above. **(DEIR at 1-6; 5-3)**. Furthermore, the environmental impacts for Projects 1-6 can all be mitigated to below a level of significance.

4.4 ALTERNATIVE 4: ROOFTOP SOLAR GENERATION

Description:

Under the Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative, solar photovoltaic panels would be installed on private rooftops.

Finding:

The Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative is rejected as infeasible, because the Project Applicant does not have the ability to install solar panels on private rooftops.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

For rooftop solar to be a viable alternative to the proposed Projects it would need to provide 172 MW of electricity into the local grid. Assuming one residential installation can produce 25 kilowatts of electricity, a total of 6,880 residential installations would be needed to produce 172 MW of electricity. The Applicant does not have the ability to install solar panels on private rooftops; therefore this alternative is not feasible for the Applicant. **(DEIR at 5-3)**.

4.5 ALTERNATIVE 5: WIND ENERGY GENERATION

Description:

Under the Wind Energy Generation Alternative, electricity would be generated through the use of wind turbines.

Finding:

The Wind Energy Generation Alternative is rejected as infeasible, because the type of geographical location that is suitable for a wind farm is not available within the vicinity.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

For wind energy generation to be a reasonable alternative to the proposed Projects and meet the purpose and need of the proposed Projects, it would need to provide 172 MW of electricity into the local grid; and to be sited on previously disturbed land that utilizes existing electrical distribution facilities, ROWs, roads, and other existing infrastructure where feasible to minimize the need for new electrical support facilities. The area required for construction and operation of a 172 MW wind farm would require a much more specific type of geographical location than the

Projects to provide adequate wind; a feasible project area of the nature required for wind electricity production is not readily available within the area of analysis for the proposed Projects. For this reason, this alternative is infeasible. **(DEIR at 5-3)**.

SECTION 5.0 FINDINDS REGARDING THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM ("MMRP")

Pursuant to Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, the Commission, in adopting these Findings, also adopts the MMRP for the Silverado Power West Los Angeles Project. This Program is designed to ensure that, during Project implementation, the County and other responsible parties will comply with the mitigation measures adopted in these Findings.

The Commission hereby finds that the MMRP, which is incorporated herein by reference and attached as Exhibit A to these Findings, meets the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 by providing for the implementation and monitoring of Project conditions intended to mitigate potential environmental effects of the Project.

SECTION 6.0 CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15091 AND 15092 FINDINGS

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the administrative record, the Commission has made one or more of the following findings with respect to each of the significant effects of the Project:

A. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects on the environment.

B. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and such changes have been adopted by such other agency, or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the administrative record, and as conditioned by the foregoing:

A. All significant effects on the environment due to the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible.

SECTION 7.0 CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15084(D)(3) AND 15084(D)(4) FINDINGS

The County has relied on Sections 15084(d)(3) of the State CEQA guidelines, which allow acceptance of working drafts prepared by the Applicant, a consultant retained by the Applicant, or any other person. The County has also relied upon Section 15084(d)(4), which allows the Draft EIR to be prepared directly by, or under contract by the lead agency. The County has reviewed and edited as necessary the submitted drafts to reflect the County's own independent judgment, including reliance on County technical personnel from other departments.

SECTION 8.0 PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21082.1(C) FINDINGS

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(c), the Commission hereby finds that the lead agency has independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR, and that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency.

SECTION 9.0 NATURE OF FINDINGS

Any finding made by this Commission shall be deemed made, regardless of where it appears in this document. All of the language included in this document constitutes findings by this Commission, whether or not any particular sentence or clause includes a statement to that effect. This Commission intends that these Findings be considered as an integrated whole and, whether or not any part of these Findings fail to cross reference or incorporate by reference any other part of these findings, that any finding required or committed to be made by this Commission with respect to any particular subject matter of the Final EIR, shall be deemed to be made if it appears in any portion of these Findings.

SECTION 10.0 RELIANCE ON RECORD

Each and all of the findings and determinations contained herein are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire administrative record relating to the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project. The findings and determinations constitute the independent findings and determinations of this Commission in all respects, and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.

SECTION 11.0 RELATIONSHIP OF FINDINGS TO EIR

The County finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the EIR or is in the record of proceedings in the matter.

SECTION 12.0 CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS

The custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the County's decision is based is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning located at 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012.

EXHIBIT A
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
("MMRP")

CEQA requires a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for projects where mitigation measures are a condition of project approval and development. The Draft EIR prepared for the Silverado Power West, Los Angeles County Projects identified mitigation measures, where appropriate, to avoid or substantially reduce the environmental impacts associated with the Project. This MMRP is designed to monitor the implementation of those mitigation measures. Accordingly, this MMRP has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097.

This section lists each of the proposed Project Design Features (PDFs) and required Mitigation Measures (MMs) and identifies the corresponding action required for proof of compliance, the mitigation timing, the party responsible for implementation, and the monitoring agency or party responsible for ensuring each measure is adequately implemented.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Silverado Power West, Los Angeles County Projects
Project Nos. R2011-00833, 00798, 00799, 00807, 00801, 00805
March 2014

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.1 AESTHETICS				
A-1 A Fugitive Dust Control Plan to minimize dust (visual pollution) shall be prepared and implemented.	A. Submit Plan to AVAQMD for review and approval	Prior to any ground disturbance activities	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP AVAQMD
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD
A-2 The Project site shall be maintained free of debris, trash, and waste during construction.	Site inspection	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP
A-3 The Project site shall be visually screened or partially screened during construction by fencing.	A. Submit Site Plans for review and approval	Prior to issuance of applicable building permit	Applicant	LACDRP
	B. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP
A-4 A landscape plan shall be developed for each Project prior to Project construction that shows the detail of a 10-foot wide screening vegetation buffer intended to screen or partially screen the Project visually from area residents or travelers on nearby roadways.	A. Submit landscape plan for review and approval. The landscape plan must be approved prior to grading or building permit.	Prior to 1st grading or building permit whichever comes first for each project.	Applicant	LACDRP/LACFD – support/referral Approval of landscape plan
	B. Implement approved landscape plan	Prior to first energization approval by LADPW B & S	Applicant	LACDRP/LACFD – support/referral Approval of landscape plan
A-5 All lighting shall comply with applicable provisions of the Los Angeles County Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Lights shall be limited to types allowed by the ordinance, installed below maximum allowed heights, pointed downwards and shielded to minimize light trespass, and mounted on	Submit final lighting plan for review and approval	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
essential infrastructure rather than on separate light poles except where poles are required by regulation or by governing agency. Lighting will comply with the hours of operation requirements in the ordinance, and utilize automatic control devices to comply with time limits except where permitted by Los Angeles County. Lighting will be maintained in good repair at all times.				
5.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY				
No mitigation measures are required for Agriculture and Forestry.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.3 AIR QUALITY				
AQ-1 Water active sites at least twice daily (locations where soil disturbance is to occur would be thoroughly watered before earthmoving) during construction.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVQMD
AQ-2 All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of CVC Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-3 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-4 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not be idle more than five minutes in any one hour.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-5 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operation of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-6 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-7 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.	Submit Transportation Demand Management program for review and approval	Prior to issuance of building permits	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPW support and referral for trip reduction determination

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
AQ-8 During array area preparation, mowing shall be used instead of grading and/or disking, and shall be limited to no more than 3.5 acres per day per site to further reduce dust emissions during construction.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-9 All interior roads shall use long-lasting non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers designed for long-term dust stabilization on dirt roads.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-10 Interior array areas shall have re-established pre-existing vegetation or be established with drought tolerant, native, or native compatible vegetation, to the greatest extent feasible, approved by the County biologist and compliant with Fire Department requirements, within two years of energization authorization of an array area by the Department of Public Works, Building and Safety Division, to provide long-term dust stabilization under the arrays.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Biologist	LACFD LACDRP
AQ-11 Earth disturbing activities shall be suspended and/or additional water shall be applied to meet Rule 403 criteria if wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP AVAQMD
AQ-12 Construction activity shall utilize electricity from power poles on or adjacent to the Project sites rather than use of temporary diesel power generators and/or gasoline power generators when electricity with adequate circuit capacity is available from power poles in proximity to construction areas.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-13 In the event temporary night lighting is necessary for construction or maintenance purposes, lighting not requiring the use of diesel or gasoline driven generators shall be used.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
B-1 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a qualified biologist shall be retained by the Applicant as the lead biological monitor subject to the approval of the LACDRP and CDFW. That person shall ensure that impacts to all biological resources are minimized or avoided, and shall conduct (or supervise) pre-grading field surveys for species that may be avoided, affected, or eliminated as a result of grading or any other site preparation activities. The lead biological monitor shall ensure that all surveys are conducted by qualified personnel (e.g. avian biologists for bird surveys, herpetologists for reptile surveys, etc.) and that they possess	A. Retain qualified Biologist(s)	Prior to issuance of Grading Permit	Applicant/Construction Monitor	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Field Surveys	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Maintain daily monitoring reports	During Construction	Applicant/Construction Monitor	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
all necessary permits and memoranda of understanding with the appropriate agencies for the handling of potentially-occurring special-status species. The lead biological monitor shall also ensure that daily monitoring reports (e.g., survey results, protective actions, results of protective actions, adaptive measures, etc.) are prepared, and shall make these monitoring reports available to DRP and CDFW at their request.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-2 Pre-Construction surveys will be conducted prior to ground disturbance at each project site. These surveys will include all special-status species identified as having the potential to be present on the project site; including, but not limited to, badger, kit fox, southern grasshopper mouse, and the species listed below. • Pre-survey information gathering will include reviewing of all available agency nest data and mapping. • A focused pre-construction Swainson's hawk survey shall be conducted to locate any nesting sites within 5 miles of Projects 1 – 6. If Swainson's hawks or their active nests are located within 500 feet of the project sites, all construction-related work shall be postponed and CDFW will be consulted. • Project-related activities likely to have the potential of disturbing suitable bird nesting habitat, which includes ground nesting birds, shall be prohibited from February 1 through August 31, unless a qualified monitoring biologist conducts nesting bird surveys prior to any construction-related disturbance to confirm the absence of active bird nests or bird nesting habitat. Disturbance shall be defined as any activity that physically removes or damages vegetation or habitat or any action that may cause disruption of nesting behavior such as loud noise from equipment or artificial night lighting. Surveys shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. If an active bird nest is discovered, disturbance within 500 feet for raptors shall be postponed until the nest is vacated, offspring are independent of the nest area and there is no evidence of further attempts at nesting. Limits of avoidance shall be marked with high-visibility flagging or fencing. The Applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures and submit the records to LACDRP and CDFW to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds. • A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted on each site prior to grading. Pre-construction surveys for burrowing owl shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to	Pre-construction surveys for special-status species that have been identified as having potential to occur on site	Prior to grading or as specified per species	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
the commencement of disturbance. The surveys shall follow the protocols set forth by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium (1993 and 2012). If burrowing owls are found during the pre-construction survey, then replacement burrows and habitat must be provided prior to the commencement of construction. The Applicant shall be prepared to provide artificial replacement burrows in the event that owls are detected, either as wintering or breeding individuals. Wintering individuals may be evicted with the use of exclusion devices followed by a period of seven days to ensure that animals have left their burrows. When it can be assured that owls are no longer using the burrows, the burrows can be hand excavated and collapsed under the supervision of the avian biologist. Breeding owls must not be disturbed and must be allowed to complete the raising of young until the fledglings can forage independently of adults and it can be confirmed that further attempts at nesting shall not be undertaken. When this has been confirmed, the owls can be evicted as described above for wintering animals. • Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for special-status ground-dwelling reptiles, including but not limited to coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard. Surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground 4 to 6 weeks in advance of the survey effort, checking weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles or other species determined important by the qualified biological monitor (i.e., biologist must be appropriately permitted for collection and relocation activities) occurring within the work area prior to the start of work shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.				
B-3 During grading, earthmoving activities, and other construction activities the biological monitor shall be present to inspect and enforce all mitigation requirements and to relocate any species that may come into harm's way to an appropriate offsite location of similar habitat. The biological monitor shall be authorized to stop specific grading or	Biological Monitoring	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
construction activities if violations of mitigation measures or any local, state, or federal laws are suspected. The biological monitor shall file a report of the monitoring activities with LACDRP and CDFW. If ongoing biological monitoring of construction activities reveals the presence of any special-status reptiles within an active work area, then work shall be temporarily halted until the animals can be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones. Work areas shall be surveyed for special-status reptile species, such as the coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard, during construction activities. During the construction, surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground in appropriate work areas and checking them weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles occurring within the work area shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-4 Mitigation lands shall be acquired for Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, special-status migratory and wintering birds, and alkali mariposa lily. Swainson's hawk: Impacts due to development of the projects shall be mitigated by the acquisition of good quality Swainson's hawk habitat targeted within the Antelope Valley. Land shall be purchased or placed in a conservation easement or other suitable deed restriction and managed to maintain suitable habitat in perpetuity. The proposed development is not expected to result in the "take" of Swainson's hawk; however, the Applicant shall be required to consult CDFW in the event of take, which may result in additional mitigation prescribed by CDFW. Although the Projects are not expected to result in "take" of Swainson's hawk, mitigation will still be required to alleviate the effects of cumulative impacts on raptor, migratory bird, and burrowing owl habitats: Replacement land will be provided based on the quality of the mitigation land relative to the impacted habitat. The ratio of such replacement shall be determined as follows: • A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 3 acres of development if the replacement land is superior nesting and foraging habitat contiguous to occupied nesting and foraging habitat, and is within a designated or proposed Significant Ecological Area (SEA). • A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 2 acres of development if the replacement land is unoccupied irrigated land, contiguous to occupied habitat and providing superior quality foraging habitat with trees or other such nesting habitat; • A ratio of 1 acre of replacement land for each acre of development if the replacement land provides similar foraging and nesting habitat. Burrowing Owl: Mitigation for any occupied burrowing owl burrows found during pre-construction surveys will include a comprehensive tiered approach: • Pre-construction and construction monitoring surveys conducted by a qualified biologist to detect potential new owl activity onsite;	A. Acquire mitigation lands for Swainson's Hawk	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Acquire mitigation lands for Burrowing Owl	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Pre-construction survey for Alkali Mariposa Lilies	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	D. If necessary Acquire Alkali Mariposa Mitigation land	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
• Disturbance avoidance of occupied burrows during nesting period February 1 – August 31; • Impact avoidance of occupied burrows; • Burrow exclusion and closure and offsite relocation (>100 m), as described previously in in B-2, will be conducted for unavoidable impacts to occupied burrows (after consultation with CDFW). • Minimizing impacts by protecting in-place any owls, their burrows, and their immediate habitat by establishing setback zones and visual screens for burrows adjacent to construction activity; by placing visible markers, and by conducting construction worker awareness training. Setback widths will be applied as appropriate to the level of existing disturbance and owl stage of activity (e.g., for low to moderate construction-related disturbance activity outside the nesting season near burrows in currently high-traffic or disturbance areas, it is assumed owls are adapted to human disturbance and will not need a large setback). • Mitigating unavoidable impacts to habitat: restore temporary impacts to pre-existing conditions; replace nesting/occupied and satellite burrows lost with the same number of suitable burrows on the mitigation site. Mitigation acreage for foraging habitat provided for Swainson's hawk will be sufficient to replace lost burrowing owl habitat because the hawk's replacement habitat will be in-kind or better (i.e., the Project habitat is low quality overall and mitigation habitat will be at least the same quality as the lost habitat OR will have higher quality habitat features overall, such as increased vegetative structure, higher numbers of prey species, less disturbance, and less potential for predation by domestic animals, etc.). Specific habitat considerations as provided in the CDFW 2012 burrowing owl guidance will be considered in selecting the overall habitat replacement acres for the project. Alkali Mariposa Lily: Alkali mariposa lily will be avoided to the greatest extent possible. If pre-construction surveys reveal individuals that cannot be avoided, mitigation of lost alkali mariposa lily shall be provided at a minimum 1:1 ratio. This acreage will be calculated with input from LACDRP and CDFW. Additionally, because alkali mariposa Lilies have locally available seed sources, plantings of the lilies on				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
appropriate soil types on Projects shall be implemented in selected areas. The lilies may also be transplanted from areas planned for disturbance to more suitable locations in the Project area. Transplantation locations must be situated within adequately buffered areas to be found suitable. For all species the mitigation acreage may be located within the Project sites, but outside of the area of development, subject to LACDRP and CDFW approval, if acreage of sufficient quantity and quality exists.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-5 Review and Approval of Habitat Management Lands Prior to Acquisition: The Applicant shall provide a mitigation land acquisition proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for their approval before acquiring the property. The proposal shall discuss the suitability of the property by comparing it to the selection criteria. As a part of the preparation of the land acquisition proposal, acreage quantification by habitat category will be developed with LACDRP and CDFW based on the following criteria: <u>Habitat Management Land Selection Criteria</u>: The Applicant must identify the region within which lands shall be acquired, and the type and quality of habitat to be acquired. Detailed criteria and acreage for each habitat category will be developed with Los Angeles County and CDFW. Foraging habitat shall be assessed as moderate to good with a capacity to improve in quality and value to Swainson's hawks, and must be within the Antelope Valley Swainson's hawk breeding range. Foraging habitat with suitable nest trees is preferred. <u>Habitat Management Lands Acquisition</u>: Prior to initiating ground-disturbing activities, the Applicant shall provide a proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for off-site mitigation land to be restored, enhanced, or maintained according to the requirements of the biological mitigation measures in this EIR. The proposal will require that mitigation lands identified shall be preserved as open space in perpetuity. Within 45 days of acquiring the mitigation land(s), the Applicant shall record a permanent deed restriction on the mitigation land(s) to be preserved as open space. The deed restriction or conservation easement language shall be submitted to LACDRP and CDFW for review and approval prior to recordation. Alternatively, should a conservation easement on the mitigation land be offered, the permanent conservation easement shall be recorded to the satisfaction of LACDRP and CDFW. The Applicant shall establish a fund sufficient for the restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation land(s) until such time when the mitigation land(s) become self-sustaining and until such time as the mitigation land(s) meet the requirements of this mitigation measure. The fund shall be established within 90 days of mitigation land(s)	A. Obtain approval of habitat management lands	Prior to Acquisition	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Record a permanent deed restriction or conservation easement on mitigation land(s)	Within 45 days of acquiring land(s)	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Establish fund in the amount acceptable to LACDRP and CDFW for restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation lands	Within 90-days of mitigation land(s) acquisition	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
acquisition in an amount acceptable to the LACDRP and CDFW.				
Land Acquisition Schedule and Financial Assurances: The Applicant shall complete acquisition, or execute an irrevocable option to purchase, of proposed Habitat Management lands and shall provide financial assurances for dedicating adequate funding for impact avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, if necessary, prior to the issuance of building permits. If an irrevocable option to purchase is utilized, the applicant shall provide a proposed date of purchase which coincides with construction of the facility.				
B-6 Prior to alteration of any streambeds, the Applicant shall enter into an agreement with the CDFW, pursuant to Sections 1601 through 1603 of the State Fish and Game Code.	Enter into an agreement with CDFW pursuant to sections 1601 through 1603	Prior to alteration of Streambed	Applicant	CDFW
B-7 Within all interior portions of the site within and adjacent to the proposed solar arrays, re-vegetation shall be accomplished (excluding interior roads as follows: Vegetation seeded in these areas shall comprise locally-sourced, native species if available, or, native compatible as approved by the County biologist if sufficient locally-sourced native seed stock not available, approximating low-growing communities such as native perennial or annual grasslands (i.e., wildflower fields). Shrub species shall not be used due to these species inability to survive continued vegetation trimming. Vegetation shall be maintained in accordance with Los Angeles County Fire Department regulations.	Revegetation of interior site, excluding interior roads	After construction	Applicant	LACDRP
5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES				
CUL-1 In the event cultural resources are encountered during construction of the Projects, all ground-disturbing activities within the vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall be notified of the find. The archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American Monirot shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to recordation and excavation of the finds and evaluation and processing of the finds in accordance with § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Potentially significant cultural resources	A. Archaeological monitoring and Native American monitor when there is a find	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP NAHC
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Site inspection as needed	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
consist of, but are not limited to, stone, bone, fossils, wood or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resources are determined to be unique historic resources as defined under § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, Mitigation Measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate Mitigation Measures for significant resources could include but not be limited to avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further earthwork shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any archaeological artifacts recovered because of mitigation will be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.			Archaeologist	
CUL-2 In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, California State Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 dictates that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to CEQA regulations and PRC § 5097.98. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.	A. Archaeological and Native American monitoring	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist/NAHC representative	LACDRP NAHC
	B. Maintain documentation demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-3 Project 4 construction of gen-tie lines shall maintain the right of way buffer zones prescribed by SCE for this historic electric transmission line resource, which is an active transmission line. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-4 Project construction for Project 4 shall maintain a one acre undisturbed area surrounding the Del Sur Cemetery	A. Submit pre-construction surveys	Prior to construction	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
site. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	B. Construction monitoring by qualified Archaeologist	During construction	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Submit construction monitoring documentation	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	D. Site inspection as needed	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-5 A County approved archaeologist will be retained to initiate and supervise cultural resource monitoring during Project related earthwork in areas of the Project that are within 50 feet from certain significant cultural resources, specifically from the defined perimeter of site CA-LAN-1579H (Project 4). If resources are identified, the procedures outlined in CUL-1 will be followed and/or CUL-2 (as necessary). This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	A. Archaeological monitoring	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
PALEO-1: A qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the Applicant prior to excavations reaching 10 feet in depth or greater. A The paleontologist shall develop and execute a Paleontological Resource Mitigation and Monitoring Program and supervise a paleontological monitor whom shall monitor all ground-disturbing activities associated with such excavations. The Program will outline the procedures to follow in regards to paleontological resources (e.g. monitoring protocols, curation, data recovery of fossils, reporting). If fossils are found during such excavation, the paleontological monitor shall be authorized to halt ground-disturbing activities within 25 feet of the find in order to allow evaluation of the find and determination of appropriate treatment according to the Program.	Paleontological Monitoring	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Paleontologist	LACDRP LAC Natural History Museum support/referral
5.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
No mitigation measures are required for Geology and Soils.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				
GHG-1 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment	A. Submit operating permit(s) as required	Prior to commencement of construction	Applicant	AVAQMD LACDRP
	B. Maintain log	During construction	Applicant/Construction	AVAQMD

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.	demonstrating compliance		Manager	LACDRP
GHG-2 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not be idle more than five minutes in any one hour.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-3 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have proper training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operations of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-4 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 mph or less.	Site inspection as needed	During construction and grading	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-5 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	Prior to Building Permit	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.8 HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS WASTES				
HH-1 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Materials Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.	Submit Hazardous Materials Management Plan	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC
HH-2 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.	Submit Hazardous Waste Management Plan for each Project	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC
HH-3 Prior to the start of construction activities on the parcel containing the historic UST at the location of Project 1, a Phase I ESA will be completed. This mitigation measure only applies to Project 1.	Phase I ESA	Prior to issuance of grading permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP
HH-4 Prior to the start of construction activities, a closure permit for the UST will be verified or obtained from the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Health Hazardous Materials Division. This mitigation measure only applies to Project 1.	Closure permit or verification for UST – Project 1 site	Prior to issuance of grading permit(s)	Applicant	LACFD
HH-5 Construction activities shall be halted if previously unidentified soil contamination is observed or indicated by testing during any earthwork activities. Construction will be halted or redirected until such soil contamination is evaluated and disposed of and/or treated	Testing of soil contamination	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC LACDRP
5.9 HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY				
Construction				
HYDRO-1 Education and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants and Employees. Appropriate educational materials and training for preventing stormwater pollution and additional BMP Fact Sheets from the California Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks can be found at www.cabmphandbooks.com. Practical information material will be provided to employees on general good housekeeping practices. These materials will describe, but are not limited to, spill prevention and control and the use of chemicals, petroleum products, pesticides and fertilizers that should be limited to the property, with no discharge of wastes directly or indirectly to gutters, catch basins or the storm drain system. Information will be distributed directly to the employees as well as being posted in public areas. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities. The required materials shall be	Maintain log demonstrating compliance of Educational materials and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants, and Employee	During Construction	Applicant	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
available at each project site and a log kept to show education has occurred prior to the start of construction.				
HYDRO-2 A spill contingency plan will be prepared by the owner/building operator. As a minimum the Spill Contingency Plan will "mandate the stockpiling of cleanup materials, notification of responsible agencies, disposal of cleanup materials and documentation." This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Submit spill contingency plan	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACDRP
HYDRO-3 No hazardous materials are anticipated to be stored on-site. If deemed otherwise, a designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in accordance with requirements of the Health & Safety Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction and operations	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACFD
HYDRO-4 A designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in compliance of the current requirements of the County of Los Angeles Fire Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Submit all applicable information	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACFD
Operation				
HYDRO-5 Site waste receptacles shall be emptied on a weekly basis or more often if containers approach overflowing. Upon inspection any debris or rubbish will be picked up and the site cleaned. The trash area/room is NOT to be cleaned by hosing down. The type of materials used to clean the area and storage of said materials will be determined by the Contractor. Signage will be posted that lids shall be kept closed at all times. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 at all times during facility operations.	A. Include waste collection and disposal methods in construction contract specifications	During operation	Applicant	LACSD LACDRP
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During operation	Applicant	LACSD LACDRP
5.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING				
No mitigation measures are required for Land Use and Planning	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.11 NOISE				
N-1 Construction operations would not occur between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday, or at any time on Sunday with the exception of limited low-noise	Maintain log of construction equipment arrivals and exit times demonstrating	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
generating potential night work with Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning and Public Works approval.	compliance			
N-2 Construction site and access road maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour shall be established and enforced during the construction period.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-3 Electrically-powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, except for devices like trucks, loaders, dozers, and other heavy equipment.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-4 Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far as practicable, and no closer than 1,000 feet, from noise-sensitive receptors.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
	B. Inclusion of requirement for a Noise Control Plan	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
N-5 The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells are prohibited except where required by OSHA or for safety or emergency warning purposes required by other regulatory agencies.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-6 Project-related public address or music systems used on-site shall not be audible at any adjacent receptor.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
N-7 All noise-producing construction equipment and vehicles using internal combustion engines shall be equipped with mufflers, air-inlet silencers where appropriate, and any other shrouds, shields, or other noise-reducing features in good operating condition that meet or exceed original factory specifications which are in compliance with any applicable legally required equipment noise standards. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors) shall be equipped with shrouds and/or other noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment. Mobile sound barriers with a sound transmission class of 19 or greater will be used for pile driving on Projects where received sound levels at the nearest NSR are predicted to be above the County construction noise limit of 60 dBA during the day.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
	B. Site inspection as needed	During Construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including: **N-8** Siting substations to achieve NEMA sound ratings at sensitive receptors as described in Section 4.11.5.2 not to be closer to the property line of sensitive receptors than the following distances for each individual project: • Project 1 – 325 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 74 dBA • Project 2 – 1,511 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 81 dBA • Project 3 – 650 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 74 dBA • Project 4 (two transformers) – 1,000 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 77 dBA • Project 5 – 748 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 82 dBA	A. Submit acoustical report demonstrating substation design compliance with applicable noise standards	Prior to issuance of relevant building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer
	B. Construct structures in compliance with noise limit requirements of applicable County codes.	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH
	C. Submit post-construction noise measurements verifying compliance upon request	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support/referral
With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including: **N-9** The Applicant shall choose to use NEMA low noise rated transformer equipment which will achieve 10 dBA or greater noise reduction as compared to standard NEMA-rated transformers of a similar size and rated capacity to ensure that Project noise impacts would be less than significant.	A. Submit acoustical report demonstrating substation design compliance with applicable noise standards	Prior to issuance of relevant building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer
	B. Construct structures in compliance with noise limit requirements of applicable County codes.	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH
	C. Submit post-construction noise measurements verifying compliance upon request	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support/referral
5.12 PUBLIC SERVICES				
No mitigation measures are required for Public Services	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.13 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC				
TT-1 Prior to issuance of first grading or building permit, Applicant shall document and submit all required information	Submit Projects' road survey	Prior to issuance of first grading or building	Applicant	LACDPW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
and/or material pertaining to the pavement conditions of construction routes for the Projects, including the formula for calculation of the Projects' fair share of any repair or reconstruction of construction routes to the satisfaction of LACDPW. Applicant shall reimburse the County of Los Angeles for the cost of any repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes attributable to the Projects as agreed to by LACDPW. The timing of any necessary repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes and the required payment by the Applicant shall be determined by LACDPW.		permit		
TT-2 The County, including LACFD Fire Stations 78 (for R2011-00801) and 130 (for R2011-00798, 00799, 00805,00807, & 00833) shall be notified at least three days in advance of any street closures that may affect fire and/or paramedic responses in the area. The Applicant shall provide alternate route (detour) plans to the County, including three sets to LACFD, with a tentative schedule of planned closures, prior to the beginning of construction.	Provide street closure notifications	Three days prior to any street closures impacting fire and/or paramedics	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACFD
TT-3 Stagger construction work shifts before or after peak traffic hours.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support referral Caltrans
	B. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support referral Caltrans
TT-4 Schedule truck deliveries during off peak hours.	Maintain log of truck arrivals and exit times demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
TT-5 Limit water truck deliveries during the AM peak hour to 30 percent of the daily water truck trips.	Maintain log of truck arrivals and exit times demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
TT-6 Encourage carpooling between construction works.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
5.14 UTILITIES				
No mitigation measures are required for Utilities.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
List of Acronyms: B & S – building and safety BMP – Best Management Practice CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act CASQA – California Association of Stormwater Quality Agencies CBC – California Building Code CDFW – California Department of Fish and Wildlife CUP – Conditional Use Permit CVC – California Vehicle Code dBA – decibels (acoustics) DPR – Department of Parks and Recreation ESA – Environmental Site Assessment hp – Horsepower LACDPW – Los Angeles County Department of Public Works LACFD – Los Angeles County Fire Department mph – miles per hour NEMA – National Electrical Manufacturers Association OSHA – Occupational Safety and Health Administration PRC – Public Resources Code ROW – Right of Way SCE – Southern California Edison SWPPP – Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan UFC – Uniform Fire Code UST – Underground Storage Tank WATCH – Work Area Traffic Control Handbook LACDPH – Los Angeles County Department of Public Health LACSD – Los Angeles County Sanitation District				